

JAN 20 1933

OPTICAL ROOM
LIBRARY
OF MICH.

Theological Monthly

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY
FEBRUARY 1933

Vol. IV No. 2

	Page
GRABER, ...	31
KROEGER, ...	35
KIRCHER, ...	35
MAIER, ...	35
SCHLER, ...	35
KRETZ, ...	119
KRETZ, ...	120
LANTSON, ...	127
KRETZ, ...	127
Dispositio, ...	135
Miscellanea, ...	141
Theologia, ...	145
Book Review, ...	153

Die Predigt ...
also das ...
die rechte ...
auch das ...
die die ...
falscher ...
führen. —

REV. ...
CONF...

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Edited by
THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:—

PROF. W. ARNT
PROF. THEO. LUTHER
PROF. L. VONKEMMER
PROF. E. E. MARTIN

BOARD OF REVIEWERS:—

Arnt, W. A.: Die Apostelgeschichte
Gassner, H.: Gott und die Cosmos
Hilgenberg, H.: Protestantisches Martyrerbuch
Harver, W.: The Center of Christian Missions
Schubert, H. A.: Among the Ogulaks
Lohmann, H.: Beginning at Jerusalem
Clark, F. A.: Religion of Old Korea
Bauer, M.: Mission in Deutschland fuer die evangel.
Lutherische Kirche Deutschlands 1932
Brett, E. W. C.: Practical Theology
Hollnagel, H. E.: Religious Education in the
Church
Wittmann, H.: Christianity and Goethe

Address all communications to the Editorial Committee
of the Managing Editor

Prof. E. E. Martin, 201 De Mar Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

All business communications to be addressed to the
Managing Editor

Concordia Publishing House, 201 De Mar Ave., St. Louis,
Mo.

Orders, notices, and other correspondence should be
sent in advance.

Printed at the Concordia Press, St. Louis, Mo., as second-class
mail matter, at special rate of postage provided for in
act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. IV

FEBRUARY, 1933

No. 2

The Modernistic Christ.*

The reader of modern theological literature sometimes happens upon a title which possesses significance, not on account of any intrinsic worth as a product of scholarship, but as a typical instance of modern thought regarding the nature of Christianity. From this point of view, Tittle's *Jesus after Nineteen Centuries* is worthy of more than passing comment. What a subject—the meaning of Jesus and the manifestation of His power in the world to-day! Proceeding from the glorious truth “Jesus the same yesterday and to-day and forever,” what cannot be said of the power of the Gospel as manifested in the world to-day in spite of the changes which have been brought about in the social and economic conditions of the twentieth century as compared with those of the first! Tittle correctly calls our world “startlingly different from the world of Jesus,” and he vividly portrays the Galilean disciples “standing to-day in one of the canyons of New York, feeling the vibration of the subway beneath their feet, hearing the honk-honk of taxicabs going in all directions, the report also of an Army and Navy football game broadcast by radio, and, high overhead, seeing the latest and largest military airship encircling the tower of the Empire State Building! Different also,” he continues, “are many of the problems with which our world is confronted. Nineteen hundred years ago ‘a sower went forth to sow’; and, no doubt, he had his troubles—stones, thorns, birds, poor soil. But, generally speaking, he needed only to sow in order to reap and only to reap in order to secure for himself and his family the necessities of life. Imagine if you can that first-century sower attempting to operate a modern farm or factory, confronted with such intricate problems as are now involved in marketing and finance” (p. 29). But instead of subscribing with Tittle to Professor Case’s jibe: If Jesus were living to-day,

* *Jesus after Nineteen Centuries*, by E. F. Tittle. 217 pages 5½×8¼. The Abingdon Press. Price, \$2.00.

"we should not elect Him President of the United States, or deposit our savings in a bank under His management, or employ Him as architect for a city sky-scraper, or ride in a taxicab with Him at the wheel" (p. 28); or of pointing out that the central problem to-day is, as in Jesus' day, "How may human beings live together securely, nobly, and happily?" (p. 31) and finding in the teachings of Christ light upon this basic problem, it would have been, if not a simple matter, yet an inspiring task for a Christian disciple of 1932 to point out the supreme need of our age — salvation from sin and from the pangs of an evil conscience — and the perfect cure for this fundamental ill of humanity in the Gospel of redemption and in the operations of the Holy Spirit upon the individual heart.

Of all this nothing, not a vestige nor a hint, in the lectures which Rev. Tittle of Evanston, Illinois, delivered at Yale University last year. Nothing of the Spirit's work. Nothing of the redemption or the atonement. Much about sins, nothing of sin. The way of repentance and faith not so much as mentioned. The deity of Christ not only ignored, but implicitly denied. Jesus is "a Jew" (p. 214). The Christmas Gospel "plainly legends" (p. 14). In His education Jesus was "considerably indebted to rabbinical literature" (p. 32). He erred when He cherished the illusion of an early transformation of human society. As for His death, it possessed no metaphysical meaning, nor was it in any sense substitutionary or an atonement for the world's sin. "He chose to die rather than countenance the desecration of a Temple which had been dedicated as a 'house of prayer for all nations'" (p. 82). The cross "is a symbol of the price that has ever been demanded for human progress" (p. 141). We are now able to believe in love as an ultimate reality and the greatest power in the world because Jesus, "first of all the son of man, lived and died with malice toward none, with charity to all" (p. 210). "On the love of God He gambled His life" (p. 206). In view of the fact that Tittle does not believe in the resurrection it is clear that, by a little straight thinking, the reader will deduce from Tittle's book that Christ *lost* in this "gamble," since He died as a criminal, with spikes driven through His hands and feet. Surely in all this the "offense of the Cross" — the teaching of the atoning power of Christ's death, the heart and all of Christianity — has been removed.

Naturally, one is interested in the manner in which Modernism treats the sources from which it must draw the picture of Jesus Christ when it would discuss His meaning to the world after nineteen centuries. The rule by which Tittle established the historical nature of the Gospel record is simplicity itself. The criterion of historical truth and error is the manner in which the various statements of the Gospel record appeal to Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle of Evanston, Illinois! He accepts the saying of Christ that a man's life does not

consist in the number of things he possesses (p. 158); he treats as historical the reference of Jesus to Himself as a servant, Matt. 20, 25. 28 (p. 162). He "steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem" (p. 141). But doubts are placed upon the use of a scourge in the cleansing of the Temple, because John's gospel, which alone mentions it, is "admittedly the least historical" (p. 98). By what right does Tittle say "admittedly" rather than "allegedly"? He will reply that the historical criticism has established this fact, completely ignoring the opposite view of scholars of the first rank like Zahn and Robertson. He illustrates the method of the higher criticism, however, by applying the criterion of his subjective impressions to such texts as Matt. 10, 6. Is this utterance, he asks, really "an echo of the mind of Jesus? Is it not rather an echo of that bitter conflict in the early Church which was precipitated by the bold and disturbing universalism of St. Paul?" (p. 82). As for the meeting with the Syrophenician woman, "at this distance it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to guess just what did happen in this admittedly difficult case" (p. 51), and since our Lord's harshness towards the Pharisees accords as little with the milk-and-water Christ of the critics as His words to the Syrophenician, Tittle regards it as "important to remember that the terrific 'woe chapter' of Matthew was written long after the death of Jesus (at a time when the relationship between Christianity and its parent, Judaism, was sorely strained) and that it was written by a man who, if Professor Bacon is right in his conjecture that he was a converted scribe, may have been not altogether free from that bitter bias which so often appears in an apostate" (p. 48). From all of which it is clear that Jesus in this volume is not pictured in the light of the Gospel-story, but as He appears in the distorting medium of the modernistic reflector. Even sayings which the historical criticism unanimously accepts as genuine, such as the directions of Matt. 18, 16. 17, are rejected by the Yale lecturer because Jesus in the same gospel "recognizes that a recalcitrant brother should be forgiven until seventy times seven"—a specimen of criticism which not only offends by its arbitrariness, but by its total lack of comprehension for the motives urged by our Lord for admonition and discipline. Yet this is cited by Tittle as proof that "Jesus, like the rest of us, occasionally fell short of perfection" (p. 20).

But what, in the opinion of this Modernist, *does* Jesus mean "after nineteen centuries"? "Sincere and fearless," "one who champions the principles of Jesus where the fighting is the fiercest," a man of "dauntless moral sense," are some of the characteristics applied on the jacket of the volume to E. F. Tittle. We have not discovered in the entire volume a statement or sentiment the utterance of which in our day would require courage or "virile championship." A modern audience of intellectuals does not gird at pacifism. Tittle calls upon

Christians to refuse participation in war. But does such a pronouncement require courage? Dr. Fosdick, some ten years ago, announced his refusal to participate in another war, and Dr. Tittle knows full well that such pacifist utterances have not entailed so much as twenty-four hours' imprisonment in a police hold-over. God forbid that we should soon enter another war; but if that calamity should occur, we shall see whether the pacifists of 1932 will fail to bless the arms of American soldiers and speak of their "spiritual mission" and "crusadership" as did the pacifists of 1910 when the "war for righteousness" was declared against Germany in 1917. *Nous verrons que nous verrons.*

Aside from this we are amazed by the assurance with which the lecturer attributes pacifism to Jesus. Tittle's line of thought is familiar to us from the announcements of the Federal Council of Churches. Our Lord extols meekness and peacemaking, demands love for the enemy, a non-resistance of evil, warns against selfishness and covetousness, rebukes Peter for using the sword, and requires the observance of the Golden Rule. From this is deduced the principle that government (whose functions involve the use of force, if it is to exist at all) shall never use armed force in order to defend its land and liberties. On such wretched logic is based the major contention of the book.

It requires no "fearless" dealing with "the challenges of the times" to preach the square deal for the workmen, an altruistic spirit for the capitalist, and a refusal of both to hire gangsters for the safeguarding of their interests. Who is there in this country that would have courage to defend the *opposite*? Yet such superficial and academic pronouncements on the rights of labor and the duties of capital are the climaxes of this book towards which in each section the author works up with a really splendid management of literary and emotional factors. "The mountains go pregnant and give birth to a mouse."

All the interests of the book are centered upon this present life. The other world never comes into view except to be shooed away with a gesture of impatience. How may human beings live together securely, nobly, and happily? So far as the principles of Jesus Christ can aid in the achievement of this purpose, they have a value for our century. The other world does not enter into the discussion. The idea of a new heaven and a new earth is "opposed both to the discoveries of science and to the revelations of history" (p. 140). The kingdom of God is not joy and peace in the Holy Ghost, but cometh with eating and drinking. When Great Britain abolished the corn laws, which were a burden upon the poor (p. 189), and when Gandhi agitates for the uplift of outcastes, Tittle recognizes the onward march of God's kingdom. The League of Nations is an outstanding example

of what Tittle considers the growing influence of Jesus Christ. Referring to the protests lodged against Japan for its attack upon China, he says: "For the first time in history a major power is being brought to the bar of world judgment" (p. 115). (David Lloyd George, one of the founders of the League, in October, 1932, with reference to the ravishing of Manchuria, calls the League's reaction "not only a failure, but a ridiculous failure.") Modernism in the volume before us declaims against high protective tariffs (p. 84) and against British domination of India (p. 86), and we are expected to applaud such gestures not only as a "trenchant dealing with the challenges of the times," but as a profound interpretation of Christ's message and the apostolic commission!

If we are to define Modernism on the showing made in this volume, it is that misinterpretation of the Christian Gospel which rules out its entire doctrinal element and which, after arbitrarily selecting from the gospels as genuine some sayings of our Lord and rejecting others, crudely mixes the provinces of Church and State in a stressing of certain general ethical principles, with a careful avoidance of any pronouncement that is out of harmony with a philosophy that centers its interests entirely upon the present life or that would bring the writer or lecturer into conflict with the *Zeitgeist*.

THEO. GRAEBNER.

Die Stellung der Frau in der christlichen Kirche.

Kurz nach Schluß der Delegatensynode im Jahre 1929 brachte das englische Blatt unserer Synode unter der Überschrift „Frauen auf Synodalversammlungen“ einen Artikel, dessen erster Satz in der Übersetzung lautet: „Die Stellung der Frau in der Kirche wurde auf der Synodalversammlung nicht einmal besprochen.“ Dieser Satz ist vielsagend. Gottes Wort hat schon längst entschieden, welche Stellung die Frau in der Kirche einnehmen soll. Dieses Wort Gottes können und wollen wir nicht beiseitesetzen. Darum — so will obiger Satz gleichsam sagen — war eine Erörterung der Sache überhaupt nicht nötig.

Die Stellung der Frau in der christlichen Kirche hat aber schon vielen Kirchengemeinschaften großes Kopfzerbrechen verursacht und ist nur zu oft falsch und schriftwidrig definiert worden. Das kommt daher, daß man das klare Schriftwort nicht achtet und versucht, dem Zeitgeist Rechnung zu tragen. Es ist darum wohl angebracht, daß wir uns mit dieser Sache etwas befassen und die genaue Stellung der Schrift kennenlernen und festhalten, um desto besser gerüstet zu sein, den schriftwidrigen Ansichten, die sich in der modernen Christenheit zeigen, mit aller Macht entgegenzutreten.

Bei der Behandlung des obigen Themas soll nun gezeigt werden:

1. Die rechte Stellung der Frau nach der Schrift;
2. die Stellung der modernen Christenheit zur sogenannten Frauenfrage;
3. das Verbot Gottes betreffs des öffentlichen Regierens und Lehrens der Frauen in der christlichen Kirche; und
4. wie Frauen im Reiche Gottes tätig sein können und dürfen.

1.

Was sagt die Schrift von der rechten Stellung der Frau? Dies zu wissen, ist nötig, weil es zum besseren Verständnis der ganzen Sache dient. Wir lassen uns die Frage von D. Pieper beantworten. Er schreibt in seiner „Dogmatik“ (I, 627 f.), wie folgt: „Aus der Schrift steht fest, daß das Weib auch vor dem Fall dem Manne gegenüber im Verhältnis der Unterordnung stand. Dies Verhältnis zum Manne ist 1 Mos. 2, 18 durch ‚seine Gehilfin‘ bezeichnet. Dasselbe ist im Neuen Testament, 1 Kor. 11, 9, ausgesprochen: ‚Der Mann ist nicht geschaffen um des Weibes willen, sondern das Weib um des Mannes willen.‘ Hieraus ergibt sich, daß es dem Weibe verboten ist, eine Herrscherstellung dem Manne gegenüber einzunehmen. 1 Tim. 2, 12: ‚Einem Weibe gestatte ich nicht, . . . daß sie des Mannes Herr sei.‘ Dies Verbot wird auf eine doppelte Weise begründet: 1. durch die Tatsache, daß Adam zuerst erschaffen wurde, danach Eva, B. 13: ‚Denn Adam ist am ersten gemacht, danach Eva‘; 2. durch die Tatsache, daß das Weib eine sehr schädliche Neuerung eingeführt hat, nämlich die Sünde, B. 14: ‚Und Adam ward nicht verführt; das Weib aber ward verführt und hat die Übertretung eingeführt.‘ Die Schrift lehrt also ganz klar, daß dem Weibe dem Manne gegenüber Unterordnung zukommt, und zwar sowohl der Schöpferordnung nach als auch in Ansehung der Ordnung, die durch den Sündenfall und nach dem Sündenfall in der Welt gilt.

„Sonderlich zu unserer Zeit ist ja die Stellung des Weibes innerhalb der menschlichen Gesellschaft zum großen Teil in Vergessenheit geraten. Es hat dies vornehmlich einen doppelten Grund. Der erste ist der, daß bei aller Bibelverbreitung die Bibel weniger Einfluß auf die menschliche Gesellschaft hat als je zuvor. Der andere Grund ist der, daß es bei allem Fortschritt in der Technik mit dem natürlichen Menschenverstand bei den Menschen sehr schnell bergab geht. Bei Luther findet sich über die Stellung des Weibes innerhalb der menschlichen Gesellschaft eine doppelte Reihe von Aussagen. Er sagt einerseits: ‚Das weibliche Geschlecht ist von Gott nicht geordnet zum Regiment, weder in der Kirche noch sonst in weltlichen Ämtern.‘ (II, 687.) Ferner: ‚Der Heilige Geist hat Weiber vom Regiment in der Kirche ausgeschlossen.‘ (XVI, 2280.) Andererseits schärft Luther ein, daß dem weiblichen Geschlecht eine besondere Ehrerbietung von seiten des männlichen Geschlechts gebühre, weil das Weib die Mutter und Erzieherin des Menschen-

geschlechts ist. „Das Weib, sofern sie eine Kreatur Gottes ist, muß mit Ehrerbietung angesehen werden; denn sie ist dazu geschaffen, daß sie um den Mann sei, daß sie die Kinder ernähre und ehrbar und gottselig aufbringe.“ (V, 1516.) Luther hält durchweg fest: Wie Gott Mann und Weib in geschlechtlicher Verschiedenheit geschaffen hat, so hat er für beide auch verschiedene Sphären der Tätigkeit bestimmt. Er sagt hierüber: „Wie ein jeglicher geschaffen ist, so wirkt er auch am geeignetsten. Es greift ein Weib viel besser zu einem Kind mit dem kleinsten Finger denn ein Mann mit beiden Fäusten. Daher bleibe ein jeglicher in dem Werke, zu dem er von Gott berufen und verordnet ist.“ (V, 1517.) Das ist eine schriftgemäße Stellung. Die Schrift verlegt den Wirkungskreis des Weibes durchaus in das Haus. . . . Die Schrift weist dem Weibe eine Herrschaft und Lehrtätigkeit im Hause zu, 1 Tim. 5, 14: „So will ich nun, daß die jungen Wittven freien, Kinder zeugen, haushalten“ (Haus herrinnen seien). Die älteren Weiber sollen nach Tit. 2, 3 „gute Lehrerinnen sein, daß sie die jungen Weiber lehren züchtig sein, ihre Männer lieben, Kinder lieben . . . , häuslich sein“ (das Haus bewachend oder Hausarbeit verrichtend).“ — So weit das Zitat. Dasselbe zeigt uns sehr klar, welches die rechte Stellung der Frau nach der Schrift ist.

2.

Wie stellt sich nun die moderne Christenheit zur sogenannten Frauenfrage? Die Antwort ist kurz die, daß man von der schriftgemäßen Stellung der Frau heutzutage wenig wissen will. Die moderne Frau will aus ihrem eigentlichen Wirkungskreis heraus. Und es gibt auch genug Männer, die den Frauen in dieser Sache das Wort reden. D. Pieper urteilt über solche, „Dogmatik“, I, 628: „Die Frauen, die aus dieser Sphäre hinaus sich in das öffentliche Leben drängen, sind naturgemäß diejenigen, welche nicht Kinder lieben, sondern den Kindersegen verhin dern möchten. Was des Weibes höchste Ehre ist, achten sie für eine Schande. Viele andere laufen, weil es Mode ist, in Gedankenlosigkeit mit. Die ‚Staatsmänner‘ (und natürlich auch die Pastoren), welche das Frauenstimmrecht als einen Fortschritt der Menschheit gepriesen und be trieben haben, haben damit bewiesen, daß in dieser Beziehung, wie bereits erinnert wurde, der gesunde Menschenverstand noch vor dem Ende der Welt bei ihnen zu Ende gekommen ist.“

Gleichberechtigung der Frau mit dem Mann! Das ist das Schlag wort der heutigen, gottentfremdeten Zeit. Man hat natürlich schon früher dahin gestrebt, dieses Ziel zu erreichen. Daher fand eine Frau im Jahre 1889 es nötig, den Weiberrechtlerinnen die ziemlich derbe Zurechtweisung zu geben: „Diejenigen, welche um die Rechte des Weibes heutzutage so viel Lärm machen, meinen im Grunde nichts anderes als das Recht des Weibes, ein Mann zu sein. . . . Ihre Anstrengungen sind ebenso einfältig wie die jenes Botanikers, der alle Johannisbeerbüsche im Lande in Eichbäume verwandeln wollte. Ebenfogut könnte sich ein

nationaler Verein bilden, um für die Rassen Amerikas die Rechte und Befugnisse der Hunde in Anspruch zu nehmen." (Luth. 45, 205.)

Und wie auf andern Gebieten, so will man die Frau gerade auch auf kirchlichem Gebiet in die Öffentlichkeit hineinzerrren. Wenn ein Schreiber im Jahre 1897 die Tatsache feststellt, daß nach Gottes Wort nur zum Amte tüchtige Männer in das Predigtamt berufen werden sollen, und dann hinzufügt: „In der modernen Christenheit hält man dies aber vielfach für unberechtigte Tyrannei, Überbleibsel aus den Zeiten des Barbarismus und des Mittelalters und dem Gedeihen der Kirche geradezu schädlich“, so scheint er das gerade für unsere Zeit geschrieben zu haben. (Ver. d. Westl. Distr., 97, 94.) Denn tatsächlich wurde vor nicht langer Zeit innerhalb der Episkopalkirche Nordamerikas ein ähnlicher Gedanke ausgesprochen. Es war genannter Kirche empfohlen worden, „auch Frauen als Prediger zuzulassen“. „Eine aus beiden Geschlechtern, aus Laien und Predigern, gebildete Kommission“ hatte über die Sache zu beraten. In ihrem Bericht heißt es: „Kein Klerus (Predigerstand) kann seinen Dienst an der Menschheit zufriedenstellend erfüllen, wenn in ihm nicht Frauen und Männer vertreten sind.“ (Luth. 1931, 426.)

In andern Kirchengemeinschaften steht es ähnlich. Gerade kürzlich wurde im „Lutheraner“ (1932, 141) berichtet: „Die Presbyterianerkirche hat zwar Frauen noch nicht zur Ordination für das Pfarramt zugelassen; doch sind solche als ruling elders, das heißt, zur Ausführung des Amtes der Ältesten, die auch predigen dürfen, zugelassen worden. Besonders in kleineren Gemeinden dürfen sie in diesem Dienst tätig sein.“ Dann wird ein Beispiel gebracht von einer kleinen Gemeinde, die predigerlos ist. Die Gemeinde hat „eine Frau, die im obigen Sinne als Älteste ordiniert worden ist, angestellt, damit sie vorderhand das Amt eines Predigers versehe“. Der Bericht schließt mit den Worten: „Voraussichtlich werden mit der Zeit weibliche Personen auch in der Presbyterianerkirche die volle Ordination zum Pfarramt empfangen. Der Zug der Zeit geht in dieser Richtung.“

In Europa finden wir dasselbe. Die englische Staatskirche hat schon vor Jahren darüber beraten, ob Frauen zum Pfarramt zugelassen seien. Auf einem internationalen Frauenskongreß, der im Juni des Jahres 1904 zu Berlin tagte, wurde unter anderm auch der folgende Satz öffentlich ausgesprochen: „Es ist sehr zu beklagen, daß den Frauen in Deutschland noch so viele Berufe verschlossen sind, wie der Advokaten- und Predigerberuf.“ Damals war es dort noch etwas Seltenes, daß eine Frau öffentlich in der Kirche als Predigerin auftrat. Als daher im Jahre 1908 der „Bremer Kirchenzettel“ für Palmsonntag ankündigte, daß im Abendgottesdienst „Rev. G. v. Behold, Predigerin in Leicester“, predigen werde, da wurde dies als etwas Außerordentliches mitgeteilt und scharf beurteilt. (Luth. 1908, 146.) Heute ist es auch da schon anders geworden. Die „N. E. L. R.“ berichtet: „In Hamburg wurde

Frl. Sophie Kunert als erste Pfarramtshelferin von Senior D. Stage am 5. Februar feierlich eingeführt; sie war bisher Leiterin der Sozialen Fürsorge am Frauengefängnis Fuhlshüttel; dort hat sie nun auch pfarramtliche Dienste. Sie könne vor ihren Pfleglingen am Altar und auf der Kanzel stehen und ihnen auch das Sakrament reichen, sagte D. Stage. In der Tat ist sie in der Hamburger Presse bereits als Frl. P. Kunert erwähnt. In derselben Stadt erfolgte am 9. Februar die feierliche Einsegnung Frl. Margarete Brauns als Pfarramtshelferin zu St. Nikolai; sie ist die erste Pfarramtshelferin in einer Gemeinde.“ (Luth. 1928, 190.)

Selbst lutherisch sich nennende Synoden folgen hierin dem Zuge der Zeit. So hat vor etwa fünfundzwanzig Jahren die finnisch-lutherische Suomisynode, wohl als die erste lutherische Körperschaft Amerikas, die „unlutherische und unbiblische Neuerung“ eingeführt, „daß die Frauen in Gemeindefachen dieselben Rechte ausüben können wie die Männer und daß deshalb auch eine Frau als Delegat zur Generalversammlung gewählt werden kann“. (Luth. 1908, 287.) Die schwedische Augustanasynode hat vor nicht langer Zeit beschlossen, „auch den Frauen das Vorrecht einzuräumen, als Delegaten auf den Synodalversammlungen zu erscheinen“, und hat tatsächlich gleich auf der ersten Versammlung „einer weiblichen Vertreterin das Stimmrecht gegeben“. (Luth. 1931, 202.) Vor etwa zwei Jahren hat das offizielle Blatt jener Synode den Gedanken ausgesprochen, „es könne auch in der Augustanasynode bald dahin kommen, daß man sich mit der Frage der Ordination von Frauen zum Predigtamt werde befassen müssen“. (Luth. 1930, 79.)

So sehen wir, wie man in der heutigen modernen Christenheit den Frauen nicht nur in Gemeinde- und Synodalversammlungen Sitz und Stimme gewährt, sondern ihnen auch den Zutritt zum Predigtamt öffnet.

3.

Was sagt nun Gottes Wort von dem öffentlichen Regieren und Lehren der Frauen in der christlichen Kirche? Die Schrift redet sehr klar über diese Sache. 1 Kor. 14, 34, 35 heißt es: „Eure Weiber laßt schweigen unter der Gemeinde; denn es soll ihnen nicht zugelassen werden, daß sie reden, sondern untertan sein, wie auch das Gesetz sagt. Wollen sie aber etwas lernen, so laßt sie daheim ihre Männer fragen. Es steht den Weibern übel an, unter der Gemeinde zu reden.“ 1 Tim. 2, 12 lesen wir: „Dem Weibe aber gestatte ich nicht, daß sie lehre, auch nicht, daß sie des Mannes Herr sei, sondern stille sei.“ Hier haben wir das klare Verbot Gottes, welches den Frauen nicht nur das Regieren in der Gemeinde, sondern auch das öffentliche Lehren verbietet. „Der erste Spruch unterscheidet gerade das Daheim und die Gemeinde. Der Spruch redet nicht davon, ob die Frau daheim lehren könne oder nicht, sondern hier ist vom Lehren in der Gemeinde die Rede, und da verbietet er es.“ (Luth. 1908, 315.) „Auf die öffentliche Lehrtätigkeit geht nach dem Kontext auch das Verbot 1 Tim. 2, 12“, wie D. Pieper in seiner „Dogmatik“

(I, 628) ausführt. Ja, „diese Worte sind so sonnenklar, daß keine Kirchengemeinschaft im Zweifel über Gottes Willen zu sein braucht. Wer trotz dieser Worte die Frauen zu Predigern einsetzt oder ihnen, obwohl Männer zur Leitung der Gemeinde vorhanden sind, das Stimmrecht gibt, der will klüger sein als Gott, der widerspricht der Schrift und wird sein Urteil empfangen“. (Luth. 1908, 315.)

Über das Stimmrecht der Frauen in der Gemeinde sagt ein Synodalbericht (Kansf. 1897, 69) das Folgende: „In den Gemeindeversammlungen sollen nur die stimmberechtigten männlichen Glieder teilnehmen. Damit sind auch ausgeschlossen die Weiber, und das mit Recht. Gott sagt in der Eva zu jedem Weibe: ‚Er soll dein Herr sein.‘ Wo bliebe aber diese Herrschaft, wenn etwa in einer Gemeindeversammlung eine Mehrheit von Frauen den Mann niederstimmen könnte? wenn das Weib die Stimme ihres Eheherrn durch ihre Gegenstimme zunichte machen könnte? Aber vielleicht möchte jemand diese Stelle in solcher Anwendung nicht gelten lassen. Wohl an, so sagt Gott klar und deutlich, daß das Weib in der Versammlung der Gemeinde nicht Sitz und Stimme haben soll, wenn er 1 Kor. 14, 34 durch den Apostel spricht: ‚Ihre Weiber laßt schweigen unter der Gemeinde; denn es soll ihnen nicht zugelassen werden, daß sie reden, sondern untertan sein, wie auch das Gesetz sagt.‘ Klarer und unmißverständlicher hat sich doch wahrlich die Schrift über keinen andern Punkt ausgesprochen. So klar, wie den Kindern gesagt ist: ‚Gehorche deinem Vater, der dich gezeugt hat,‘ ebenso klar ist hier den Weibern gesagt: ‚Schweiget unter der Gemeinde!‘ 1 Tim. 2, 12 schärft Paulus das nochmal ein und spricht: ‚Einem Weibe aber gestatte ich nicht, daß sie lehre, auch nicht, daß sie des Mannes Herr sei, sondern stille sei.‘ An dieser göttlichen Ordnung hat auch die Kirche jederzeit festgehalten; erst in unserer letzten Zeit, wo wir auf die Grundsuppe alles Greuels und aller Teufelei gekommen sind, stellt man auch diese wie alle andern Ordnungen Gottes auf den Kopf. Doch wir wollen bei Gottes Wort bleiben und sagen daher: Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde; Sitz und Stimme gebührt da nur den Männern.“

Es wurde schon kurz erwähnt, daß Gottes Wort den Frauen auch das öffentliche Lehren verbietet. D. Pieper führt dies in seiner „Dogmatik“ weiter aus. Er stellt zunächst die Frage: „Was ist vom öffentlichen Lehren und Reden der Frauen zu halten?“ Seine Antwort lautet: „Bekanntlich ist man in einigen Sektentkreisen über diese Frage längst hinaus. Schriftstellen wie 1 Kor. 14, 34. 35 und 1 Tim. 2, 11—15 werden, weil angeblich auf ‚orientalischer Anschauung‘ beruhend, als Norm für unsere Zeit abgelehnt. Es ist auch nach Luthers Stellung gefragt worden. Aber Luther ist keine unser Gewissen bestimmende Autorität, wiewohl Luther, wie wir bereits früher sahen, einerseits sagt, daß dem Weibe ‚Ehrfurcht‘ (reverentia) gebühre als der Mutter des Menschengeschlechts, andererseits sehr entschieden betont, daß das Weib nicht zum öffentlichen Lehr- und Regieramt geordnet sei. Was die

Schrift lehrt, sei hier, wo es sich um eine christliche Lebensnorm handelt, nochmals kurz zusammengefaßt. Die Frauen sollen *καλοδιδάσκαλοι* sein (Tit. 2, 3) der Kinder und vor Frauen. Sie sind dazu besonders geschickt, weil sie „Kinder lieben“ (*φιλότεκνοι*, Tit. 2, 4). Aber das öffentliche Reden und Lehren ist ihnen untersagt, nicht nach orientalischer, sondern nach Gottes Anschauung, weil Gott durch seinen inspirierten Apostel sagt 1 Tim. 2, 12: „Einem Weibe gestatte ich nicht, daß sie lehre.“ (Dogm. I, 639.)

Gewiß, wer Gottes Wort stehen läßt, der muß erkennen, daß Gott der Frau das öffentliche Regieren und Lehren verbietet. Es sei hier aber doch auf zwei Einwürfe aufmerksam gemacht. Solche, die den Frauen auf kirchlichem Gebiet eine regierende und lehrende Stelle einräumen möchten, weisen hin auf Gal. 3, 28. Die Stelle lautet: „Hier ist kein Jude noch Grieche, hier ist kein Knecht noch Freier, hier ist kein Mann noch Weib; denn ihr seid allzumal einer in Christo Jesu.“ Diese Stelle soll beweisen, daß den Frauen das öffentliche Lehren nicht verboten werden darf. Hören wir, wie D. Pieper diesem Einwurf begegnet. Er sagt: „Die beliebte Verufung auf Gal. 3, 28 ist ein eklatanter [offenbarer] Mißbrauch der Stelle, da sie von dem gleichen Anteil an der von Christo erworbenen Gnade und Seligkeit handelt, aber den Unterschied der sozialen Stände nicht aufhebt. Derselbe Apostel, welcher Gal. 3, 28 geschrieben hat, sagt 1 Tim. 2, 12: „Einem Weibe gestatte ich nicht, daß sie lehre“, und 1 Kor. 14, 35: „Es steht den Weibern übel an, unter der Gemeinde zu reden.“ (I, 639.) — Der zweite Einwurf ist der, daß man die angeführten Schriftstellen als „orientalische Anschauung“ bezeichnet, die darum für die heutige Zeit nicht mehr gelten könnten. Zu diesem Einwurf schreibt D. Pieper: „Bekanntlich wird die biblische Anschauung, nach welcher das Weib seine Tätigkeitsphäre im Hause hat, als ‚orientalisch‘ bezeichnet. Man hat allen Ernstes behauptet, der Apostel Paulus würde, wenn er an amerikanische Gemeinden geschrieben hätte, nicht gesagt haben: „Es steht den Weibern übel an, unter der Gemeinde zu reden“, und: „Ein Weib lerne in der Stille mit aller Untätigkeit. Einem Weibe gestatte ich nicht, daß sie lehre“, sondern er würde in Anbetracht der verschiedenen Verhältnisse so oder ähnlich sich ausgedrückt haben: ‚Women to the front!‘; ‚Get on the platform!‘; es steht den Weibern nicht übel an, unter der Gemeinde zu reden. Aber es liegt hier eine große Täuschung vor. Daß wir es 1 Kor. 14 und 1 Tim. 2 nicht mit einer temporären, ‚orientalischen‘, sondern mit einer allgemeingültigen Ordnung zu tun haben, geht aus der Begründung hervor, die der Apostel sofort hinzufügt. Er begründet sein Veto gegen die öffentliche Rede- und Lehrtätigkeit des Weibes 1. durch die Schöpferordnung, nämlich damit, daß Adam zuerst gemacht ist, danach Eva; 2. durch die Rolle, die das Weib beim Sündenfall gespielt hat, nämlich damit, daß Adam nicht ward verführt, das Weib aber ward verführt und hat die Übertretung eingeführt.“ Diese Tatsachen bleiben dieselben im Orient

und im Okzident und zu allen Zeiten und so auch die auf diese Tatsachen gegründete Ordnung." (Dogm. I, 629.)

In dieser Verbindung sei noch die Frage beantwortet: Können Frauen unter Umständen an der Beratung der Gemeindegeschäfte teilnehmen? Der schon erwähnte Synodalbericht (Kans. 1897, 69) antwortet: „Es könnte der Fall eintreten, daß eine Gemeinde ganz oder doch insoweit nur aus Frauen bestünde, daß keine oder nicht genug Männer da wären, um die Gemeindeangelegenheiten zu leiten und zu besorgen. Wie man in solchem Falle Frauen zur Besorgung der Gemeindegeschäfte herbeiziehen müßte, so könnte man es auch nicht hindern, daß sie an der Beratung dieser Geschäfte teilnähmen, da sie dann nicht des Mannes Herr würden. Ja, wie in solchem Falle, wenn sonst alles richtig ist, Kirchenzucht geübt werden kann, so könnte durch die Wahl solcher Frauen auch ein Pastor berufen werden. Aber das ist ein Ausnahmefall, und es dürfte ein solcher Zustand, wo er einträte, nie und nimmer ein fortdauernder werden, sondern müßte der Regel weichen, sobald diese sich durchführen ließe.“ Im „Lutheraner“ hieß es vor Jahren: „Ja, es wäre der Fall möglich, daß eines Pastors Zuhörerenschaft und ganze Gemeinde aus lauter Frauen bestände, und der Pastor dürfte deshalb nicht zweifeln, daß er eine rechte Gemeinde mit allen Vollmachten einer solchen habe.“ (Luth. 51, 10.)

Vergleichen wir nun das klare Verbot Gottes mit der Handlungsweise der Kirchengemeinschaften, deren wir im zweiten Abschnitt Erwähnung taten, so müssen wir urteilen, daß sie den Boden der Schrift verlassen und sich nach ihrer elenden Vernunft gerichtet haben. Bei ihnen trifft zu, was der selige D. Pieper einst zu dieser Sache bemerkte: „Die Sekten verfälschen nicht nur das Evangelium, sondern brechen auch vom Gesetze Gottes ab, je nachdem es der Zeitgeist fordert.“ (Luth. 45, 206.) Davor möge der treue Gott uns aus Gnaden bewahren!

4.

Wie können und sollen die Frauen im Reiche Gottes tätig sein? Die Sekten werfen uns gerne vor, daß wir den Frauen ja gar keine Stelle in unsern Kirchen einräumten, daß wir ihnen keine Gelegenheit gäben, etwas für Jesus zu tun. Dies ist ein grober Irrtum. Die Frauen nehmen allerdings eine wichtige Stelle in der Kirche ein, und ihrer viele haben schon Großes im Reiche Gottes getan, Großes nicht im Sinne der Welt, aber in Gottes Augen. Die Schrift ist reich an solchen Beispielen, die uns zeigen, wie Frauen im Reiche Gottes tätig sein können; ebenso die Kirchengeschichte. Doch würde es zu weit führen, diese Beispiele hier eingehend zu schildern. Wir fassen uns darum ganz kurz und nennen nur einige Stücke, die den Frauen reichlich Gelegenheit geben, im Reiche Gottes tätig zu sein.

„Zunächst sollen die Frauen ihrem Gott dienen, indem sie Gottes Haus treulich besuchen, wo sie nach dem dritten Gebot das Wort Gottes gerne hören und lernen sollen. . . . Wenn Frauen trotz vieler Hinder-

nisse durch Hausarbeit, Pflege des Mannes und der Kinder das Wort fleißig hören, so ist das ein sonderliches Zeichen einer gottseligen Gesinnung und ein treffliches Stück ihres Christenwandels": Maria von Bethanien; die Prophetin Hanna; Maria, die Mutter Jesu; Hanna, die Mutter Samuels. (Luth. 1908, 346.)

„Wenn die Frauen zur Kirche gehen, so können und sollen sie wachsen in der Erkenntnis. Das haben sie nicht nur für die eigene Seele nötig, sondern auch für die ihnen anbefohlenen Kinder. Überlegen sie das in der Kirche Gehörte recht, so wächst die Erkenntnis. Nur so können sie Gesetz und Evangelium recht teilen, der Kinder Sünden recht strafen, aber die betäubten Sünder auch recht trösten lernen aus Gottes Wort": Lydia, der Gott das Herz aufthat; die Mutter Jesu. (Luth. 1908, 346 f.)

„Wenn Frauen in der Kirche Gottes Wort fleißig hören, so können sie dort auch zur Hebung des Gottesdienstes viel beitragen, nämlich durch ihren Gesang. Ihre Stimmen eignen sich oft besser zum Singen als die Stimmen der Männer. Begabt Gott die Frauen mit guten Stimmen, so sollen sie diese in seinen Dienst stellen": Mirjam; jüdische Frauen bei der Heimkehr Sauls und Davids. (Luth. 1908, 347.)

„Und Christinnen können im Gotteshaus und daheim für Kirche, Schule und Haus beten": Maria; Hanna; Monika. „Unsere Gemeinden und Missionen haben das Gebet christlicher Frauen sehr nötig. . . . Und wie das Gedeihen der Missionen und Gemeinden frommen Frauen am Herzen liegt, so sonderlich das Seelenheil der eigenen Kinder, und sie begleiten mit ihrem Gebet den Knaben zur Schule, zum Konfirmandenunterricht, zur Arbeit, ins Geschäft, zum College und zum Seminar. Hier kann und soll jede Frau dem Werke der christlichen Kirche helfen." (Luth. 1908, 347.)

Auch am Geben für Gottes Reich sollen Frauen, je nachdem Gott sie mit irdischen Gütern gesegnet hat, teilnehmen, indem sie durch Darreichung ihrer Geldgaben die Mission und die Arbeit in der eigenen Gemeinde unterstützen. Das ist ein gottgefälliger Dienst, den sie damit verrichten. (Scherflein der Witwe.)

Gerade auch im Gemeindeleben gibt es manche Gelegenheit, wo Frauen Handreichung tun können, indem sie z. B. die Kranken pflegen, Witwen und Waisen trösten, Notleidende versorgen und dergleichen mehr. (Tabea.) Oder gehen wir über den Kreis der Gemeinde hinaus. Auch da kann die Frau dem Werke der Kirche helfen, indem sie z. B. für arme Studenten, für Waisen, für Hospitäler oder Altenheime näht. (Ratharina von Bora.) Und wenn der Apostel sagt: „Herberget gerne", so gilt das den Frauen ebenso wie den Männern. (Lydia, die Purpurträgerin: Paulus; die Witwe zu Tharpath: Elias; die Sunamitin: Eliza.) Zu dem letzten Beispiel wollen wir eine treffende Bemerkung aus einem Synodalbericht hinzufügen. Da heißt es (Zowa 1906, 34): „Es geschieht dem Lande im allgemeinen und der Kirche im besonderen

ein ungleich größerer Dienst, wenn eine Sunamitin den Propheten Elisa erquidet und stärkt, damit er seinem Amte desto besser vorstehen kann, als wenn halb närrische Frauenzimmer redend im Lande umherziehen und Schankwirtschaften zerschlagen und zertrümmern. Wie mancher Reiseprediger wäre vor der Zeit aufgerieben, wenn er nicht sein Sunem hätte, wo er Einkehr halten und sich erquiden könnte!"

"Und Frauen können sich durch Wort und Werk zu Jesu bekennen. . . . Oft kommt im Gespräch mit Nachbarn, Bekannten und Freunden die Rede auf Religion, auf Kirchengehen, Beten, Bibellesen, auf lutherische Gemeindeschule, und da gilt es, zu bekennen, was unsers Herzens Glaube ist. Da gilt auch der Frau: 'Wer mich bekennet vor den Menschen, den will ich auch bekennen vor meinem himmlischen Vater.'" (Luth. 1908, 347 f.)

"Schließlich dienen christliche Frauen durch gottgefälligen Wandel im eigenen Hause dem Reiche Gottes. Was der Prediger auf der Kanzel lehrt über Glauben, Liebe und Hoffnung, Keuschheit, Milde, Geduld, Fleiß, Sparsamkeit usw., das leben sie daheim und missionieren so in ihrem Kreise. Gott ruft alle, die er in seinen Weinberg ruft, zum Arbeiten. So auch die Frauen in ihrem Gebiet. In treuer Häuslichkeit, in herzlicher, liebevoller Unterordnung gegen den Mann, in mütterlicher Zärtlichkeit gegen die Kinder legen christliche Frauen ein lautes Zeugnis ab gegen den Irrtum unserer Zeit, der von der rechten Stellung der Frau im Hause nichts mehr wissen will. Hier, in der Erziehung ihrer Kinder, hat die Frau ihr herrlichstes, eigenartiges Arbeitsfeld. Könige und Propheten, Apostel und Märtyrer haben auf dem Schoße ihrer Mütter reden und beten gelernt. Welch eine Verantwortung hat da Gott den Frauen gegeben! Die Seelen ihrer Kinder dem Heiland zuzuführen, sie für den Himmel zu erziehen, ist ihr schwerster, seligster Beruf auf Erden. Es ist wichtig, daß sie den Kindern das Leben schenken, sie mit Mühe und Not jahraus, jahrein speisen und kleiden, sie in Schwachheit und Krankheit hüten und pflegen; aber wichtiger ist, daß sie die Seelen der Kinder zu dem weisen, der gesagt hat: 'Lasset die Kindlein zu mir kommen', daß sie die Lippen ihrer Kinder zu Jesu beten lehren." (Luth. 1908, 348.)

Wir schließen nun die Abhandlung über „Die Stellung der Frau in der christlichen Kirche“ mit einem Zitat und einer Schlußbemerkung.

Das Zitat steht in D. Piepers „Dogmatik“ (I, 629) und lautet: „Die Frau von dem Ehrenplatz im Hause in die öffentliche Tätigkeit zu zerren, davon sollte uns die allgemein anerkannte Tatsache abhalten, daß die Frau die einflußreichste Lehrerin des menschlichen Geschlechts ist. Sind die Frauen im Hause ‚gute Lehrerinnen‘, Tit. 2, 3, so haben sie größeren Einfluß auf die heranwachsende Generation als die Männer samt den Pastoren und Schullehrern zusammengenommen.“

Die Schlußbemerkung lautet: Halten wir das fest, was Gottes Wort über die Stellung der Frau in der christlichen Kirche sagt, so ist

zweifellos klar: Das öffentliche Regieren und Lehren ist den Frauen verboten; trotzdem haben sie einen großen und seligen Beruf, der jeder Frau, die ihren Heiland liebhat und ihm dienen will, reichlich Gelegenheit bietet, sich im Reiche Gottes und im Dienste der christlichen Kirche zu betätigen.*)

A. C. Kröger.

Archeology — the Nemesis.

When, at the middle of the last century, the epoch-making excavations in the Mesopotamian Valley lengthened the historical perspective and pushed back the horizon of the ancient Orient, these archeological discoveries were hailed with mixed feelings. An attitude of doubt and suspicion clashed with an exaggerated credulity. While a wealthy British student of ancient chronology paid a young Assyriologist a retaining-fee for three years, binding him to search for parallels to the Old Testament (with the startling result that detailed, yet utterly spurious accounts of where Paradise was, where the fall of man occurred, where Cain slew Abel, and where the Tower of Babel was built, were given; Budge, *Rise and Progress of Assyriology*, p. 127), the number of scholars who doubted the validity of the transliterations and translations was not inconsiderable.

Notable in the latter group were critical minds that in spite of their characteristic inclination to explore new avenues of departure remained anchored on their old critical basis. The great Noeldeke, prince of Semitists, as late as 1871 declared that the results of Assyriology both in matters of linguistics and history were characterized by "a highly suspicious air." The school of Wellhausen, with its dominant emphasis upon the history of religion, paid scant attention to archeology and dallied with it as a toy of sophisticated Semitism. A perusal of Julius Wellhausen's *History of Israel* shows the pronounced indifference with which he regarded Assyriology.

This neglect has proved fatal to many of the theories which have been set up as canons of criticism. Archeology has convincingly demonstrated its capacities as a nemesis of higher criticism. Scores of hasty judgments and other scores of intricate theories, spun out of critical fancy, now appear as entirely fallacious in the light of archeological research. And while it is a thankless task to enumerate

*) Diese Stimme aus dem Kreise unserer südamerikanischen Brüder bringen wir um so lieber, da der Artikel zeigt, daß auch dort im Geiste der Schrift gelehrt und gearbeitet wird, eben auch in Bezug auf diese praktische Frage. Die kirchliche Arbeit christlicher Frauen sollte ganz und gar unter Aufsicht und Leitung der Ortsgemeinde geschehen. Dies schließt keineswegs aus, daß eine größere kirchliche Körperschaft durch eine systematische Ordnung der Arbeit solcher Frauenvereine ein größeres Ziel erreichen kann.

A. C. K.

negatives and to collate errors, the cumulative force of the archeological rejection of higher critical extravagances must react very decidedly in emphasizing the truth of the Scriptures.

Since higher criticism has particularly three methods of attack by which the authenticity and the veracity of the Biblical books are assailed: the arguments based on language, situation, and theology, I have selected the following typical instances in which higher critical dicta have been nullified or reversed by subsequent archeological data in the fields of philological research, historical investigation, and the comparative study of Semitic religions. When the demonstration is completed, I leave to the individual reader the personal verdict on the validity of the British critic's oft-endorsed statement: "The attempt to refute the conclusions of criticism by means of archeology has signally failed. . . . The archeological discoveries of recent years . . . have revealed nothing which is in conflict with the generally accepted conclusions of critics." (Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. XVIII.) For, while there are few "generally accepted conclusions of critics," it will be shown that one theory after another, definitely accepted and endorsed by higher critical authorities, has receded before the modern advance of scientific Old Testament study.

I. Refuted Arguments from Literary Criticism.

One of the fundamental premises of higher criticism is the *Sprachbeweis*, the arguments from language, literary analysis, stylistic peculiarities, syntactical developments, and the historical and etymological background of individual words. There is a certain validity to the study of language development. In some very obtrusive respects the postexilic Hebrew differs from the Hebrew of Israel's golden age in the early monarchies. There are definite syntactical phenomena which are characteristic of the late language and, just as definitely, certain forms and expressions that are Pentateuchal. We can single out a number of terms that are restricted to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles and correspondingly call attention to a series of word forms that are limited to a much earlier age.

But higher criticism has drifted widely from these natural and inevitable marks of literary history. It is claimed, on the strength of a long and definite list of words, that these individual terms could not be used by individual authors at the time which the Scriptural account presupposes. There are terms and constructions in Davidic psalms, it is claimed, which must be postexilic and are therefore *prima-facie* evidence that the poetry in question cannot be Davidic. There are marks of foreign influences, critics say, in reputedly early books which show that these writings must date from the later years of foreign contacts. There are documents in

the Old Testament which by their very style repudiate the Scriptural claim for their originality.

Now, some of these higher critical strictures have been repudiated by an examination of word occurrences in the Old Testament itself. The shortened form of the *nota relationis* which occurs in some of the later books cannot be a sign of later Hebrew because it is similarly found in a document which many critics claim to be the oldest original part of the Old Testament, the Song of Deborah, Judg. 5. Similarly the integrity of Isaiah's prophecies is emphasized by the recurrence of demonstrably Isaianic terms in both the "First" Isaiah (1—39) and in the hypothetical "Second" Isaiah (40—66). Until the beginning of the last generation practically all the arguments against literary criticism were internal and idiomatic, drawn from Scriptural usage and occurrence. But with the rise of the archeological sciences external standards of judgment were afforded, and it is here that the very stones have cried out against some of the most ingenious and intricate theories which have been raised up on the basis of language to challenge the Scriptural veracity. Among the noteworthy reversals of higher critical opinion we may note the following typical instances.

A. Critical Arguments Based on Word History.

It is the claim of Max Mueller (*Encyclopedia Biblica*, col. 3,687) in regard to the title "Pharaoh" that "the Hebrews can have received it only after 1000 B. C." He asserts that the term was unknown in Egypt, in the way in which the early Biblical writers know it, until that time. If this statement were true, it would of course wipe out with one stroke the entire Mosaic authorship of those Pentateuchal portions which employ the term. As a matter of fact, however, Mueller's contention was set aside by the archeological light on this title, its meaning, and its abundant use long before 1000 B. C. The occurrence of the term in *The Tale of Two Brothers* shows its common employment several centuries before the time permitted by critical analysis. It is now definitely recognized on all sides that the term "Pharaoh" is the Hebraized "Per'o" (Herodotus: "Pheron"). As early as the fourth dynasty, centuries before Moses' time, several different hieroglyphics preceded the name of the Egyptian king as distinctive titles. Among these there was a drawing of a structure "representing the façade of a building, perhaps a palace." Now Alexandre Moret (*The Nile and Egyptian Civilization*, p. 130) summarizes the meaning of this symbol: "An old term for the royal palace establishment and estate, Per'o, 'the great house,' and this gradually became the personal designation. In the Memphite period this came to designate the king himself."

Similar objections have been raised against the admissibility of Joseph's Egyptian name, Zaphnath-paaneah, as well as against the

name of his Egyptian wife, Asenath. It was argued that these names were unknown in Joseph's time. For instance, Kraal, thirty-five years ago, declared that names of this formation were not found until the XXII dynasty, and he used this as "an important aid for the dating of the Elohist source." Again, Cheyne (*Encyclopedia Biblica*, col. 5,379) originally held that this was an adaptation of Pianhi, a famous Egyptian ruler of the XXV dynasty, suggesting this as an indication of the late date of the Joseph narrative. Later, moved by his Jerahmeel theory, he held Zaphnath as a corruption or alteration of Zarephath, making Joseph's entire name Zarephath-Jerachmeel!

Again archeological evidence has removed these objections. The best identification of Joseph's name is one suggested by Lieblein, in whose *Dictionnaire de Noms*, p. 55, the name is explained as "the one who supplies us the nourishment of life," on a splendid linguistic equation of the Greek and Hebrew, in concordance with Joseph's situation and particularly in the closest harmony with the historical requirements. In the XIV dynasty three kings are directly mentioned with the compound titles featuring the principal element in Joseph's name.

In regard to Asenath and the critical attack upon the history of this word (cf. Hastings, *Bible Dictionary*, col. 2,775), the identification of Kyle (*Moses and the Monuments*, p. 38) shows that archeology is again decisive in removing the unwarranted contention that this name betrays late authorship. It has now been definitely established that the root *snt* is a woman's name, which appears from the early days of the XI dynasty on. In Hebrew, as frequently in the case of proper foreign names, the root is prefixed with a prosthetic aleph.

To pass by other similar instances in which higher criticism has created a false historical background for individual Hebrew terms, we may take a concluding example from the last pages of Israel's history. Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 545) attacks the authenticity of the edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1, because of the Jewish phraseology and Jewish point of view. The particular instance of this alleged Jewish phraseology which he urged is the employment of the term "king of Persia." This, he claims, is non-historical, asserting: "Persia was absorbed and lost in the wider empire of which, by Cyrus's conquest of Babylon, the Achaemenidae became the heirs; hence after that date they are in royal inscriptions called regularly not 'king of Persia' but (most commonly) 'the king.' . . . In the extant royal inscription, 'king of Persia' occurs only once, and that in combination with other titles." In thus repeating the argument originally advanced by Ewald and lending to it the appearance of archeological support, which Ewald could not offer, Driver again relieved himself of one of those premature critical contentions which have been proved

as false on the basis of subsequent archeological research. For in addition to the notable work of the late Robert Dick Wilson (*Princeton Theological Review*, 1905—6), in which the wide-spread occurrence of the title "king of Persia" was accurately demonstrated, we now have complete evidence that this title was used in the royal inscriptions by these Achaemenidae. With the discovery of additional inscriptions since the time of Driver's indictment we have the situation summarized in the contemporaneous *Realenzyklopaedie fuer Keilschriftforschung* (I, 335): Cyrus conquered Babylon in 539. He took into account the kingdom of Babylon and called himself "king of Babylon and of the lands." Once, within a text, he is designated in an exceptional way as "king of Persia" (*Parsu*). (*Yale Oriental Society*, VII, Plate 8.) His successors, Cambyses and Darius I, retained this designation (*i. e.*, "king of Persia"). Under this light, what becomes of the claim of Driver that the Achaemenidae after 539 are regularly not called "king of Persia" when archeological investigation has now shown us that this is the title which the successors of Cyrus regularly took? What verdict is to be pronounced upon his rejection of the edict of Cyrus when we see that Cyrus himself uses the very name which Driver finds so objectionable in the Hebrew text? It must be apparent that the nemesis of archeology has once more pursued and overtaken the extravagant fictions of the *Sprachbeweis*.

B. Critical Argument Based on Style.

But Driver, as quoted above, finds not only the phrase "king of Persia" contrary to contemporary usage, he also brands the style of the edict of Cyrus as expressive of "a Jewish point of view." It is significant that Eduard Meyer took issue with this position in 1896, in his *Die Entstehung des Judentums*. He asserted: "An unbiased historical investigation has led many to the conviction that the documents of the Persian period must exactly resemble the traditional documents of the Book of Ezra." And then he uttered a prophecy which was destined to be fulfilled in a most remarkable manner: "If in the future a larger number of Persian government edicts come to light, these objections will probably vanish entirely."

Archeological investigation made this supposition of Eduard Meyer a startling reality. In the ruins of the frontier fortress at Elephantine in Egypt, papyri were recovered in 1904 among which, in addition to private papers, there were several official decrees of the Persian government and a number of official reports on the Jewish community at Elephantine. Here at last was an opportunity for the comparison of the official documents preserved in the Scripture and those originating directly in the Persian governmental circles. Meyer, definitely and sometimes radically critical, sums up the result of this comparison and says triumphantly: "These documents, resurrected

from the ruins, agree in style and vocabulary with the documents in the Book of Ezra in such detail that no doubt may be entertained any longer in regard to the authenticity of the latter." (*Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*, p. 4.)

Similarly another stylistic argument was advanced against the superscriptions of the psalms. It was held that they could not be an authentic and integral part of the original record of the psalms, added by the author himself. Thomas Chalmers Murray, in his *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Psalms*, p. 102, says that the first reason why these titles are regarded by all scholars whose opinions carry weight as of editorial origin is that "it is contrary to all we know of Shemitic style for the author to add notes or superscriptions such as these to his poems or works." That objection might have had some appeal to skeptical minds in 1880, when Murray published his book; but in the half century that has intervened since then hundreds of Babylonian psalms have been uncovered, literary productions that were written centuries before David's time. They afford a very definite means of checking Murray's statement. And once again archeology repudiates higher criticism. These Babylonian and Sumerian psalms have superscriptions exactly parallel in principle to those of the Hebrew psalms and containing some of the definite annotations (e. g., in regard to musical instruments, purpose, melody, etc.) found in the titles to the various Scriptural psalms. Thus, while higher criticism definitely insisted that the Psalter titles were *sui generis* and later additions, it is now found that they are part of the literary conventions in at least large portions of the Semitic world.

C. Critical Arguments Based on Aramaisms.

One of the commonest objections of literary criticism against the authenticity of many books of the Bible is the alleged presence of Aramaisms, words that were taken over into the Hebrew from the cognate Aramaic. These were regarded as definite marks of late authorship. It is commonly held that these Aramaisms crept in at a time when the Aramaic influence was strongest, i. e., in the exilic and postexilic periods, when the Hebrew was gradually crowded out by the ascendancy of the northern speech. Consequently the claim is made that, whenever an Old Testament book contains these Aramaisms, it betrays its late, postexilic, origin. This use of Aramaisms as age markers has been a standard part of the stock in trade of modern criticism. It pervades commentaries like those of Briggs and Gunkel; it is repeatedly employed by Driver and has been developed into book form, for example, by Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament*.

Until the horizon of ancient linguistics was widened by the scientific study of comparative languages which archeological research made possible, the only explanation to which conservative interpreters

could take recourse was to show first that Aramaic is a very ancient language, its early occurrence being endorsed by the Aramaic of Laban in Gen. 31, 47. This, it was correctly inferred, must demonstrate conclusively that Aramaic cannot be employed as an age marker since, with this evidence of early occurrence, Aramaisms could have been adopted by the Hebrews from the patriarchal times.

But when the mounds of Babylonia and Assyria were uncovered and thousands of tablets in the related cuneiform were brought to light, it became possible to use these and other associated discoveries for a systematic and scientific comparison of the various Semitic languages. This collation showed that Old Testament words which were regarded as Aramaisms (chiefly because they were *hapaxlegomena* in Hebrew, while they occurred more frequently in Aramaic) were in reality often part of the common Semitic vocabulary, words which doubtless would have found repeated expression in the Hebrew had an extant literature in that language not been restricted to the relatively small portions preserved for us in the Old Testament Scriptures. By exhaustive comparisons of the Semitic languages and dialects, Wilson shows that according to the laws of consonantal changes that exist among all Semitic nations not more than five or six roots can definitely be said to have been borrowed from the Aramaic by the Hebrew. And such borrowing, the natural and inevitable procedure among neighboring nations (especially among those with such close racial and linguistic relations as existed between the Hebrews and the Arameans), can by no cogent reasons be made evidence of exilic authorship. On the contrary, Hermann Gunkel, who had previously made liberal use of the argument from alleged Aramaisms, now warns: "The task of distinguishing Aramaic words which are to be found in the most ancient texts from those which were not introduced until later times is a problem for the future. In the mean time it is only with the greatest reservation that we should draw the conclusion of a late origin from Aramaisms." (*Old Testament Essays*, 1927: "The Poetry of the Psalms," p. 119.) The discovery of Cappadocian cuneiform tablets dating from before 2000 B. C. show distinct Aramaizing tendencies and give evidence of the early existence of the Aramaic and its wide contacts. Bauer and Leander have thrown a bombshell into the critical camp by asserting that the oldest Hebrew showed Aramaic roots. — All this again demonstrates that the higher critical dating of the Psalms and of other sections of the Scriptures which are assigned to a postexilic age because of alleged Aramaisms must be surrendered.

D. Critical Arguments Based on Word Forms.

This attack of higher criticism is highly technical. It seizes, for example, certain words of particular form or ending and asserts that these peculiarities betray a literary age which contradicts the Biblical

authorship. In the case of Ecclesiastes, for example, the abstract ending *uth* is one of the main philological arguments against the Solomonic authorship, the critical contention alleging that this ending is late. But since these claims have been advanced, new archeological discoveries have enlarged the comparative Semitic vocabulary, and it has become evident that these abstract endings, branded as signs of late authorship, occur in the Assyrian or Babylonian of the Code of Hammurabi and the Tel-el-Amarna letters, in the historical and omen inscriptions of Assyria, and in other records from the time of 2000 B. C.

Even more thoroughly has the similar theory involving nouns ending in *on* and *an* been scouted by the advances of Semitic linguistics. For the Babylonian, Assyrian, Arabic, and Aramaic can now be shown to have contained many words with these terminations.

As the field of literary attacks on the Hebrew of the Old Testament is surveyed from these various angles, one gains the conviction that in the coming years, as the conquest of Semitic philology increases, other assaults of the *Sprachbeweis* will be destined to similar frustration and that indeed the other contentions from comparative history and comparative religion, on which the subsequent article will dwell, are doomed to the same end.

W. A. MAIER.

(To be concluded.)

Studies in Eusebius.

(Concluded.)

Melito, bishop of Sardis, in a letter presented to Aurelius, called Christianity "the philosophy which began under Augustus." (Eusebius, IV, 26.) The narrative about the persecution in Gaul under Marcus Aurelius, in V, is among the most important in the *Church History* of the bishop of Caesarea, untainted by the flattery of his later references to Constantine. This persecution occurred in 177 A. D., especially in Lugdunum and Vienne on the Rhone. The report given by the churches there, sent to the churches in the provinces of Asia and Phrygia, is the longest citation in the whole history of Eusebius, and it seems to have been composed in Greek. One is almost compelled to infer that Greek was still the language in which Scripture was read in the services and perhaps also the language of the sermons. Irenaeus was trained in Asia Minor and wrote Greek. Socially even the Christians (Eusebius, V, 1) had become marked men, being excluded from the public baths and the market-place. The leaders of the Christians were fearless. The report quotes Rom. 8, 18 precisely: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to

be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (really to us: *εις ἡμᾶς*). After suffering much from the mob in the streets, taunts, blows, stones, robbery, etc., the Christians were imprisoned until the proconsul arrived. Prominent among them was a young man, Vettius Epagathos,¹⁶⁾ a fearless confessor. He was executed, "having followed the Lamb whithersoever it led." Some weakened in the persecution. All the most eminent members of the two churches were in time imprisoned. Some pagan domestic servants of Christians also were arrested, and these, fearing torture, lied to the Roman authorities, saying the Christians celebrated "Thyestian feasts and practised Oedipodean sexual cohabitations." Those lies stirred the community to fury. The time had come when the Lord's prediction came true (John 16, 2): "Every one who kills you will think that he is doing a service to God."¹⁷⁾ Of those on whom the fury of the mob and of the authorities was particularly concentrated the report mentions particularly Sanctus, a deacon of Vienne, Maturus, recently baptized, Attalus, a native of Pergamos, one of the pillars of the church, and especially the maiden Blandina, servant of a Christian mistress. Blandina suffered every kind of torture from morning to night. "She grew new in her confession" (renewed her strength). She persisted, "I am a Christian, and no evil thing is done in our company." Sanctus answered none of the questions whatsoever; the only thing he said, in Latin, was, "I am a Christian." Finally the torturers applied glowing metal plates (*λεπίδας*) to the tenderest parts of his body. His whole body finally was "one great wound or swelling." Another martyr was the woman Biblias, who said, "How could the Christians eat little children since they do not even consume the blood of animals?"¹⁸⁾ She was executed. Other tortures were inflicted in the prison; indeed, most of these martyrs were suffocated or strangled. The report further dwells on the death of Potheinos, a deacon of the church of Lugdunum; he was more than ninety years old. He was brought by soldiers before the tribunal of the Roman governor. The latter asked him who the God of the Christians was. Potheinos answered, "If you be worthy, you will learn it." After two days in prison he breathed his last. Those who denied were not discharged, but also imprisoned, not with the confessors, however, and were even taunted by the pagan mob as ignoble cowards. Among the last sufferings of Maturus and Sanctus was this: they were seated on a glowing iron seat, on which their bodies were literally fried; they were sacrificed, "becoming a spectacle (*θέαμα*) to the world." Blandina, fastened on a wooden frame, a kind of cross, was exposed to the beasts. As none of these would touch her, she was taken back to prison. Attalus

16) Notice the Greek name.

17) The citations in the early Church, as a rule, agree very closely with our New Testament text.

18) Cf. Acts 15, 20.

was conducted around the amphitheater, a tablet preceding him on which was written in Latin: "This is Attalus, the Christian." When the governor heard that he was a Roman, he determined to await the official answer of the emperor. In this interval many of the non-confessors repented and gained new courage and bravely approached the tribunal once more. The answer of the emperor¹⁹⁾ was this: Some (those who were Roman citizens) should be beheaded; those who denied should be discharged. The non-Roman confessors were condemned to be thrown to the wild beasts. Those who denied are called in the report persons "who had no wedding-garment" (Matt. 22, 11). A distinguished physician, Alexander, a Phrygian by birth, had nodded encouragement to those undergoing trial; the governor, noticing this through the outcry of the populace, condemned him to share the fate of Attalus. The latter, while being roasted on the glowing iron seat, said to the mob in Latin: "Behold, this is eating human beings,²⁰⁾ and that is what you are doing." Being asked what God's name was, he said, "God has not a name like a human being." Only one day was left of the gladiatorial shows, and there were brought forward Blandina and a youth of eighteen, Ponticus. He, cheered on by Blandina, expired first. She alone was left and died last, notwithstanding all the previous tortures she had endured, being tossed on the horns of a wild steer. — What was done with the corpses of the martyrs? Those strangled in prison were thrown to the dogs. The other physical remnants of the martyrs were guarded by soldiers. Various were the utterances of the pagans. Some said, "Where is now their God, and what did the worship profit them which they chose instead of their own lives?" A Christian burial was absolutely denied the martyrs, and the physical remnants were burned to ashes and cast into the Rhone. The pagans did this with taunts: "Now these martyrs will never see resurrection!" Those who survived or escaped with their lives refused, in the associations of the Christians, to be called martyrs; "we are only humble confessors." (Eusebius, V, 2.) In one of these official Christian reports it is said that they looked to the exemplar of St. Stephen, the protomartyr, who prayed (Acts 7, 60), "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."²¹⁾ Col. 1, 18 our Lord is called "the First-born from the dead."

The churches in Gaul also, through the presbyter Irenaeus, sent to Rome, to Bishop Eleutherus, a list of martyrs: 1) of those who had been beheaded; 2) of those who had been thrown to the wild beasts;

19) The "philosopher" on the throne.

20) May I once more refer to the Christian apologist Minucius Felix (*From Augustus to Augustine*, p. 51), a careful study of whom will explain much of the wide-spread fury in the Roman Empire against the Christians.

21) The Greek corresponded precisely with our text. No classical text is to us so perfectly certified as the New Testament, to say nothing of the ever new finds of Egyptian papyri.

3) of those who had died in prison; 4) of the confessors who survived. (Eusebius, V, 4.)

The survey of the gospels as set down by Irenaeus should not be overlooked. (Eusebius, V, 8.) He says that Matthew wrote in Hebrew while Peter and Paul (?) in Rome were preaching the Gospel and laying the foundation (*θεμελιούντων*) of the Church. After their end, Mark, the disciple and interpreter (*ἐρμηνευτής*) of Peter, presented the preaching of Peter and gave it to us in writing (*ἐγγράφως*); and Luke, the follower of Paul, laid down in a book the gospel presented by him. "Then John, the disciple of the Lord who rested on His breast, also himself gave out the gospel, dwelling in Ephesus, in Asia" (the province). Irenaeus wrote five books, dwelling in the fifth on the Revelation of John and on the name of the Beast, Rev. 11, 7 and chaps. 13—20. John, says he, saw his vision near the end of the reign of Domitian. The Virgin Birth was denied by the Ebionites.

In the reign of Commodus (180—192 A. D.) there began at Alexandria the Christian school, or college (*διδασκαλεῖον*), under Pantainos, which gained eminence through Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who was a pupil of Pantainos.

As to the list of bishops of Jerusalem, after the change by Hadrian into Aelia Capitolina a list of fifteen bishops is given. (Eusebius, V, 12.) None of them has a Hebrew name; they are all Greek or Latin; Narkissos was the thirtieth "after the apostles."

Some of Polycarp's memories of John were from direct association (Eusebius, V, 20), *οὐκ ἐν χαρτῇ*, "not on paper." That such records were treasured, goes without saying.

Even then a bishop of Rome, Victor (Eusebius, V, 24), at the time of the contention about the celebration of Easter, tried to assume autocratic power, threatening to excommunicate Eastern bishops who based their claim on ancient tradition. Irenaeus in Gaul, too, opposed Victor.

On the whole, Eusebius, in his outlook and record, follows the chronology of the emperors. After Commodus came Septimius Severus, whose arch is on the northerly end of the Forum Romanum.

At Rome there arose a new sect, led by a certain Artemon; these sects not only studied Aristotle, Euclid, Theophrastus, and Galen, the physician, but also disputed the texts of the New Testament, being thus precursors in the classic domain of higher criticism (Eusebius, V, 28) and calling Christ a mere man. Their own texts of the New Testament differed greatly from one another.

Eusebius begins Book VI by turning to Alexandria, where under Emperor Septimius Severus the father of Origen, Leonides, was beheaded. Eusebius then devotes much study to the childhood and youth of Origen, whom he admires and whom he strives to delineate from earliest childhood, when his father (chap. 2) was overjoyed because

of the eagerness of his gifted son in studying the Scriptures and of the searching spirit which he manifested; the study of Greek letters and philosophy came later. When his father died a martyr, Origen was about seventeen, and he had six younger brothers. His father's estate had been taken by the imperial fiscus. At this point a rich man undertook to support him. The Christian teachers, or catechists, had been driven from their work. (Eusebius, VI, 3.) This persecution came under Severus, when some pagans desired instruction in the Christian doctrine. One of these, Plutarch, eventually became a Christian and a martyr; his brother Heraclas later became bishop of Alexandria. At eighteen he came to be the teacher of the catechetical school. The attendance he gave to the martyrs was so earnest and so conspicuous that the mob of Alexandria almost stoned him. His pupils were very numerous. In all this he was under the authority of Bishop Demetrius. Finally selling his classical library, he lived on four obols a day (about 3 cents in our money) and led an extremely ascetic life, having not even two tunics, according to Matt. 10, 9; no shoes, no wine, etc. Eusebius says he gained more pupils by his living than by his teaching. Some of these became martyrs under Septimius Severus.

Potamiaia and her mother were burned at the stake in Alexandria (Eusebius, VI, 5); a soldier, Basileides, was beheaded. Caracalla succeeded his father Septimius Severus in 211 A. D. (Eusebius, VI, 8.) Clement says (Eusebius, VI, 14) that John made a "spiritual gospel."

Much of what Eusebius has given to posterity here consists in lists of writings of Christian bishops, which, however, we must pass over as well as the slurs against Origen by the Neoplatonist Porphyry, the pupil and biographer of Plotinus. (Eusebius, VI, 19.) We also learn of the Hebrew erudition of Origen. The ever-repeated data of the canon of the New Testament by Origen (Eusebius, VI, 25) may lead us to the reflection that this was necessary because of the incessant production of fictitious books and the urgent need of sharp discrimination against the Gnostics. (Eusebius, VI, 25.) We also notice that the claim for the preeminence of Peter, based on Matt. 16, 18, was wide-spread; and he cites John 21, 25: if one were to write the deeds of Christ in detail, "the world could not hold the books written."

It may be worth while to present the reasons why Origen did not believe that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews: "That the type of style of the epistle written to the Hebrews has not the peculiarity of the language of the apostle, which evidently is that of a layman, that is, the style; but that in the composition of the style it is more Greek, every one who knows how to judge differences of style would admit. And again, that the thoughts of the epistle are wonderful and not

inferior to the confessedly apostolic writings, this, too, any one attentive to apostolic reading would admit." There were some who assigned the epistle to Clement of Rome or to Luke. Even bishops listened to the lectures of Origen, such as Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoktistos of Caesarea. (Eusebius, VI, 27.)

The persecution under Emperor Maximinus Thrax (235—238 A. D.) was noted by Origen in his book on *Martyrdom*, and he marked the time in Book 22 of his *Exegesis of John*, in various letters. (Eusebius, VI, 28.)

The productivity of Origen was astounding: thus on the first third of Isaiah he wrote twenty-two tomes. Merely to enumerate all his writings would require a separate study. (Eusebius, VI, 32.) Pamphilus, the predecessor of Eusebius at Caesarea, seems to have gathered a wonderful library, out of which the *Church History* of Eusebius was eventually compounded. Marcus Julius Philippus, "Philip the Arab," emperor from 244 to 249 A. D., was reputed a Christian (Eusebius, VI, 34) — "there is a tradition" (*κατέχει λόγος*). But he had brought about the assassination of Gordianus. ("In no part of his public life, not even on his coins, has he left the least trace of his Christianity." Neander, I, 126.)

It was at this time that Origen wrote his treatise *Against Celsus*, the contemporary of Marcus Aurelius.

Under Emperor Decius (249 A. D.), even Origen suffered; he had to wear an iron collar, and his feet were put into the stocks. (Eusebius, VI, 39.)

The sufferings of Christians under Decius at Alexandria are discussed with every detail by a contemporary, Dionysius (Eusebius, VI, 41), during the persecution. Origen died 253 A. D., under Gallus, in his sixty-ninth year, at Tyre, where he was buried (Eusebius, VII, 1).

Repeatedly we observe that bishops were elected by the people (*χειροτονία*, VII, 9), also, that candidates for Baptism were examined, questions and answers being uttered before the congregation. Here, too, we learn of the Eucharist. Dionysius admitted a communicant who had recanted his heresy and wrote about it as follows: "When he had listened to the Eucharist [the liturgy introducing it], and had joined in uttering the amen [of the congregation], and had approached the table, and had stretched out his hand to receive the holy food, and had received it, and had shared at the proper time in the body and blood of our Lord."

Regarding the persecution under Valerian I must limit myself to a few points. (Eusebius, VII, 11.) When Dionysius at Alexandria was called upon by the Roman official Aemilianus to abandon his faith, he answered with the words of Acts 5, 29 (Dionysius farther on cited from the official minutes of the trial). Aemilianus said to the

Christians brought before his tribunal: "The emperor will spare you if you will turn to that which is according to nature and worship the gods who save their throne." To me it seems that a flood of light is thrown on the whole question why the Christians were persecuted: political loyalty was taken to be bound up with the acceptance of the Roman gods. Conformity was now demanded. What a change since Augustus!

Gallienus, son of Valerian, who lingered in Persian captivity, issued an edict (255—256 A. D. or so) stopping the persecution, which Eusebius presents in a translation from the original Latin. I present it in English: "The Emperor Caesar Publius Licinius Gallienus, Pius, Felix, Augustus, to Dionysius, and Pinnas, and Demetrius, and the other bishops: I have ordered that the benefaction of my gift shall be spread abroad through all the world; that they shall withdraw from the places of worship. And therefore you, too, may avail yourselves of the general tenor of my decree, so that no one shall trouble you. And this, which by measure of possibility can be carried out by you, has now long ago been granted by me. And therefore Aurelius Quirinius, who is in charge of the greatest matter, will observe the tenor of my grant." In another decree bishops were permitted to recover the places of the "so-called cemeteries."

Still (Eusebius, VII, 15) at Caesarea a military officer, Marinus, was executed because he refused to sacrifice to the emperors. (Neander, I, 140, calls him Marius.) The chair, or "throne," of James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, was still preserved in the time of Eusebius. (VII, 19.) Tertullian relates a similar habit in the churches of his own time in *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*.

Dionysius (VII, 24) tells of Nepos, who used the Apocalypse to found a sect of his own, for Chiliasm. It was a time of material ease and luxury. Dionysius held a three-day conference with those affected by this doctrine and brought them to see their error. He adds his view or remarks on John's gospel, his first epistle, and the Apocalypse, speaking in great detail on authenticity and authorship.

The figure and ambition of Paul of Samosata. The excommunication of this worldly and unchristian bishop of Antioch was at last accomplished after the accession of Aurelianus, 276 A. D. The trial was conducted largely by a synod, or council, of bishops, but the finer work was done by Malchion, head of the "Greek schools" at Antioch (Eusebius, VII, 29) and also by a presbyter of the church at Antioch. The record made by stenographers (*ταχυνγράφοι*) was preserved. Paul, the bishop (Eusebius, VII, 30), had become rich through fees and gifts, had surrounded himself with pomp, held a scepter, was proud, arrogant, and worldly, removed hymns that were sung in honor of Christ, made "an income" of religion (1 Tim. 6, 5), dismissed one woman (his wife), and now had two other handsome ones in his house-

hold. The members had to appeal to the secular government to remove him from the bishop's house. (*On the Manicheans*; Eusebius, VIII, 31.)

From this point on, say from Aurelianus onward, Eusebius begins to write of incidents in his own life. In all fairness we may infer that, if he took such pains to use documents of the first order for the period from the apostles down, then this last period was set down with the same scrupulous regard for truth.

In an anticipatory phrase Eusebius designates the period of Emperor Diocletian that of "the siege of the churches." (From now on Eusebius introduces such a multitude of persons and characters that we must be careful to limit ourselves to the more important; whom to select is not easy. Scholars, naturally, appeal to him very much.) It was at the time of Bishop Tyrannos that this "siege of the churches" "flourished" (*ῥημασεν*). He gives a succinct survey of episcopal successions up to Diocletian's persecution, which was felt everywhere as the greatest of all, "the persecution of our own time." Speaking of Hermon, bishop of Jerusalem: "He received the apostolic chair, which is still preserved there." Tertullian referred to this conservative habit of the churches which I have referred to above.

Eusebius sums up the seven books preceding the eighth as "the succession to the apostles." And this term is significant — not so much the adherence of Christians to the Bible as the framework of a sacerdotal system and tradition was his chief interest; not so much the priesthood of *all* Christians as presented 1 Pet. 2, 9.

Many servants at Diocletian's court were Christians. There were fine churches also and large ones, "houses of prayer (*προσκυτηρίαι*), in all the cities." Gibbon's computation that the Christians composed but one-twentieth of the total population is, on the very face of it, absurd. But much worldliness had crept in, says Eusebius — jealousy, backbiting, bitterness, hypocrisy, and insincerity; "our shepherds were inflamed with love of autocratic power." Repeatedly the bishop of Caesarea called the persecution a "divine judgment." (VIII, 1.) His design (VIII, 2) was that his narrative should be "useful" to his own and to future generations of Christians.

The persecution began in the army (chap. 4); many withdrew from military service or were degraded to the ranks. (It was in 303 A. D.) Both Diocletian and Galerius were then at Nicomedia and issued their edict there.

Among the first sufferers were courtiers and pages. They were ordered to sacrifice. Too often flogging followed, after which vinegar and salt were applied to the wounds, and finally the martyr was placed on a metal brazier, made glowing, until he expired. Such was the fate of Peter, one of the imperial pages (chap. 6). Others were strangled. The bishop of Nicomedia was beheaded. The ashes of

those burned were thrown into the water that their tombs might not be honored. The prisons were filling with bishops, presbyters, deacons, readers, and exorcists. The provinces of Africa and Mauretania and the Thebaid district in Egypt suffered especially.

What happened in the great commercial city of Tyre (chap. 7) Eusebius witnessed himself, probably in the amphitheater, when wild beasts, also steers and boars, were let loose against the Christians. In the end they were all dispatched with the sword and their bodies thrown into the sea to prevent their being given a Christian burial. In the Thebaid of Egypt peculiar forms of torture were employed: the bodies were scraped with potsherds and drawn upward by the feet, even those of women; others were torn apart by tree-tops drawn together and then loosened (chap. 9). This went on for years. Sometimes ten were executed, at other times more than twenty or thirty, even sixty. Eusebius personally visited these regions and made inquiries on the spot.

Some Christians came forward voluntarily, worshipping the Triune God, singing psalms at the end. Some of those brought before the tribunals of heathen judges were distinguished by wealth, birth, and culture, *e. g.*, Philoromos, who had held a high position in the department of finance, and Phileas, the bishop of Thmuis. A simple denial of Christ would have saved these two. Both were beheaded.

The last message of Bishop Phileas to his church at Alexandria is given in full by Eusebius (chap. 10), including the citation from Phil. 2, 6. They were made to suffer even while being examined by the Roman official. If they merely "touched" the pagan sacrifice, they were freed. The bishop in his letter quoted also the First Commandment as strengthening the Christians in their refusal. A small town in Phrygia, the inhabitants of which were all Christian, was burned, men, women, and children, by Roman legionaries (chap. 11). In some cases Christian women were threatened with having their daughters thrown into houses of prostitution (chap. 12).

Eusebius calls it all a truceless war (*πόλεμον ἀσπονδον*) of the Roman government against the Christians (chap. 13). Diocletian retired to private life, and Galerius in the East and Constantius in the West became Augusti. The latter contented himself with destroying Christian chapels and churches. (At this point Eusebius reveals his flattery of Constantine.) Maxentius (in Italy, the new Caesar), from political motives, assumed for a while protection of the Christian religion, while Maximinus Daza, the new Caesar in the East, almost outdid Galerius as to acts of cruelty (chap. 14). In the eighth year of the persecution (310 and 311 A. D.) a change for the better seemed to come (chap. 16). Galerius began to suffer from an awful disease, of "worms," while his body exhaled an intolerable stench (*cf. Lactantius, De Mortibus Persecutorum*), and he then issued the edict to stop the

persecution. Eusebius, chap. 17, presents it as translated by himself from the Latin. (Cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, pp. 186—188.)

Of Books IX and X, which contain some repetitions, I will limit myself to the selection of several points particularly instructive to a modern student of church history. I now turn to X, 2 ff.: the rebuilding of churches, sometimes with financial aid given by the government. Eusebius took particular pains to transcribe such decrees from Latin to Greek (chap. 2).

The finest of these rebuilt churches (chap. 4) was that at Tyre in Phenicia. The joy it gave the Christians to possess this church reminded them of the joy of the Jews when the Temple at Jerusalem had been rebuilt after the Babylonian captivity. One seems almost to hear a sermon in this church and a vivid expression of Christian faith, especially the words of praise. "But the second cause of our blessing, the Introducer of the knowledge of God, the Teacher of the true worship of God, the Destroyer of the impious, the Slayer of tyrants, the Regulator of life, Jesus, the Savior of us that had been despaired of, let us extol Him while naming Him, because He, being the only (*μονότατος*) perfect (*παραγὰός*) Son, in the expression of the paternal kindness to mankind, assuming (*ὑποδύς*) our nature, prostrate below in destruction, like the best of physicians, on account of the salvation of the suffering ones He beholds dreadful things, He gathers personal sorrow for the troubles of others, He Himself saved not only those who were diseased nor only those oppressed with awful ulcers and wounds actually festering, but from the very caverns of death." Scriptural allusions are often interwoven with this discourse: "Looking down upon the living temple of us all and gazing upon the house of living and well-established stones [a temple], well and safely built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the Corner-stone, whom rejected not only they of the ancient and no longer existing architecture [the Jews], but also the modern average mankind, being evil builders of evil [structures]. But the Father both then and now, having approved then and now, has established Him as the Head of the corner of this our common church."

The new edifice faced the rising sun. There were four transverse colonnades, with an open view to the sky in the middle. Cedars of Lebanon were used for some of the woodwork. The altar was in the center of the church, surrounded by a network of wooden structures. The ceiling was of marble. The baptistery was outside of the church proper.

The decree of Constantine and Licinius for freedom of worship is presented in a version from the Latin (X, 5), with the allusion to the Decree of Milan, 313 A. D., and now directing the restoration of the church property to the Christians on the part of the Roman officials, without demanding payment on the part of the Christians.

New York, N. Y.

E. G. SIHLER.

Luther und Zilsdorf.

Bekannt ist, daß Luther „seine Rätthe“, wie er sie in einem Briefe an D. Rühel am 4. Mai 1525 zum ersten Male nennt, nicht nur als Gattin sehr hochgeschätzt hat, sondern auch ihre Fähigkeit als Hausherrin und Verwalterin seines Hauswesens anerkannte und bewunderte. Er selber war in Geschäftssachen sehr unerfahren, hatte außerdem auch nicht die Anlage, die ihn befähigt hätte, Voranschläge zu machen und seine Hauswirtschaft in sparsamer Weise zu führen. Vor seiner Verheirathung bezog Luther ein Gehalt von 100 Gulden, aber diese Summe wurde nach seiner Verheirathung von Kurfürst Johann dem Beständigen verdoppelt, und dessen Sohn und Nachfolger, Johann Friedrich der Großmütige, setzte 300 Gulden an. Im Jahre 1536 kamen hierzu noch regelmäßige Lieferungen von Korn und Malz, Holz und Heu, so daß Luther selber im Jahre 1540 seine Einnahmen auf 300, seine Totaleinnahmen auf 400 Gulden berechnete. Dazu kam noch, daß schon im Jahre 1525 das Schwarze Kloster Martin Luther und seiner Rätthe überwiesen wurde, obwohl die rechtsgültige Verschreibung des Eigentums nicht bis zum 4. Februar 1532 erfolgte. Die Gabe schloß ein das Kloster in seinem ganzen Umfange „samt dem Garten und Hofe, nichts davon ausgeschloffen, zu einem rechten und freien Erbe, frei von allem Schoß und jeder Dienstleistung, mit dem Rechte zu brauen, zu mälzen, zu schenken, Vieh zu halten und jede andere bürgerliche Handlung zu treiben, unter der einzigen Beschränkung, daß bei einem Verkauf dem Fürsten und seinen Nachfolgern das Vorkaufsrecht gewahrt bleiben sollte“. (Krofer, Katharina von Bora, 79 f.)

Die hiermit gegebenen Rechte waren in der Folgezeit vom allergrößten Wert für Katharina Luther; denn ihr Ehegemahl hatte, wie oben gesagt, wenig Geschick in sparsamer Haushaltung, und manche Schilderungen seiner wirtschaftlichen Lage in seinen Briefen und andern Dokumenten sind geradezu tragikomisch. In einer Hausrechnung vom Jahre 1542, worin er auch sein sämtliches liegendes und bewegliches Eigentum aufführt, finden sich folgende Anmerkungen von seiner Hand: „Es gehört gar viel in ein Haus. Willst du es aber rechnen aus, So muß noch viel mehr gehn heraus; Des nimm ein Exempel mein Haus.... Ich armer Mann, so halt' ich Haus. Wo ich mein Geld soll geben aus, Da dürft' ich's wohl an sieben Ort Und fehlt mir allweg hier und dort.... Zum besten düngt der Mist das Feld, Der von des Herren Füßen fällt. Das Pferd wohl fein gefüttert wird, Wo ihm sein Herr die Augen gibt. Der Frauen Augen lochen wohl, Wohl mehr denn Magd, Knecht, Feu'r und Kohl'n.“ (XXIb, 2825 ff.)

Rätthe packte von Anfang an wider zu. Zunächst schaffte sie im Hause selbst Wandel; denn dort hatte weder Ordnung noch Reinlichkeit geherrscht, und Luther hatte oft wochenlang sein Bett nicht gemacht. Aber sie machte auch recht bald Gebrauch von den Rechten, die mit dem Besiß

des Klostereigentums verbunden waren. Ein großer Teil dessen, was sie für Küche, Keller und Haushalt gebrauchte, wuchs in den Gärten, auf den Feldern und in dem Viehhofe, die zum Kloster gehörten. Sie hatte sofort mit der Schweinezucht begonnen, und es war darum für sie ein ziemlich schlimmer Verlust, als im Spätherbst fünf der Tiere eingingen, deren Fleisch Luther lieber aß als Wildbret. Auch Geflügel aller Art bevölkerte den Klosterhof, und es wird erzählt, daß Kätthe mehr als einmal ihrem Gatten neuausgeschlüpfte Küchlein brachte, woran auch er seine Freude hatte, so daß er immer wieder von neuem die Wunder der Schöpfung pries. Schon in der ersten Zeit nannte Luther seine Hausfrau scherzweise den „Morgenstern von Wittenberg“, weil sie in der Regel schon vor Tagesanbruch in ihrem Beruf tätig war.

Wegen des großen Haushalts, den Luther und Katharina führten, da sie nicht nur ihre eigenen Kinder und das Gesinde versorgten, sondern im Lauf der Zeit auch etwa elf Verwandten- und Freundeskinder, wozu noch die vielen Kostgänger kamen, die auf kürzere oder längere Zeit die Gastfreundschaft des Schwarzen Klosters genossen, fand die Hausfrau den Klostergarten bald nicht mehr groß genug für die wachsenden Bedürfnisse. Hier konnte der Hausherr, der allerdings ein Liebhaber von Blumen war, ihr nicht sehr viel helfen; denn er wurde bald zu sehr in Anspruch genommen. Aber er konnte wenigstens die nötigen Verhandlungen einleiten, um weitere Stückerl Landes für Gartenzwecke zu erwerben, nachdem er schon im Jahre 1527 wiederholt von seinem Freunde Rink Sämereien für den Klostergarten bestellt hatte. So weit reichte sein Interesse auch in späteren Jahren, so daß seine Hausfrau sich bestimmt auf ihn verlassen konnte, wenn es auch, wie berichtet wird, manche Träne gekostet hat, ehe sie ihren Martin dazu brachte, den ersten Garten zu kaufen. Wie Proker angibt, bewirtschaftete Frau Doktor Luther Anfang der dreißiger Jahre ein anderes Gärtchen, das ihr Gatte nicht freiwillig, wie er selber eingesteht, sondern sehr gegen seinen Willen gekauft hatte. Mit diesem Garten war ein Stück Feld oder Wiese verbunden, eine Breite oder Hufe groß. Das Grundstück lag nicht weit vom Elstertor. Bedeutend größer war der Garten, den Luther und Kätthe im April 1532 von einem gewissen Klaus Wilsenhauer kauften und der später als der Garten am Saumarkt bezeichnet wird. In einem Briefe, den Luther am 2. Juli 1540 an seine Ehefrau schrieb, finden wir als erste Anrede die Worte: „Meiner herzlieben Kätthe, Doktorin Lutherin und Frauen auf den neuen Saumarkt, zu Handen.“ (XXIb, 2485.) Noch später, im Jahre 1544, wurden ein dritter und vierter Garten, der Hopfengarten an der Spede und der im Elsholze, erworben. Außerdem kaufte Luther noch für seinen Jamulus Wolf Sieberger ein kleines Gärtchen sowie das Häuschen, in dem sein Freund Brisger gewohnt hatte. Ohne den so erworbenen Grundbesitz hätte Frau Luther wohl kaum ihren großen Haushalt durchzuführen vermocht.

Sollten aber diese Gärten ihren Ertrag an Gemüse, Kirschén, Bir-

nen, Äpfeln, Pfirsichen, Nüssen, Weintrauben und Hopfen, sowie auch Maulbeeren und Feigen in geringeren Mengen, liefern, so mußte der Viehstand mit diesem Wachstum Schritt halten. Pferde erwähnt Luther in einem Briefe an seine Hausfrau, am 27. Februar 1537 von Gotha aus geschrieben: „Du magst dieweile sonderer Pferde mieten zu deiner Notdurft, liebe Kätthe, denn mein gnädiger Herr wird deine Pferde behalten und mit dem M. Philipp heimschicken.“ (XXIb, 2157.) Nach einer Liste von 1542 hatte Kätthe in ihrem Besiz 8 Schweine, 2 Mutter= schweine und 3 Ferkel, 5 Kühe und 9 große Kälber, eine Ziege mit ihren beiden Zicklein, außerdem wenigstens ein Spann Pferde, da Luther bei Ausflügen und Besuchsreisen sich um diese Zeit gern eines Wagens bediente, wenn die Pferde in Wittenberg waren.

Die Erwähnung von Pferden aber, die auf eine ausgedehnte Wirtschaft schließen lassen, führt uns zur Besprechung des Gutes Zilsdorf (Zölsdorf, Zeilsdorf), das während der letzten Jahre von Luthers Leben eine ziemlich hervorragende Rolle in seinen ökonomischen Verhältnissen gespielt hat. Kätthe hatte schon in den dreißiger Jahren die Absicht gehabt, ein kleines Landgut zu bewirtschaften, und es war ihr auch endlich geglückt, das kleine Vorwerk Woos zu pachten, das etwa eine Meile süd= östlich von Wittenberg jenseits der Elbe lag. Hatte sie aber dieses Gütchen nur pachtweise übernommen, so war dies nicht der Fall bei dem Gut Zilsdorf. Dies war der letzte Rest des väterlichen Vermögens der von Bora, aber Kätthes Bruder Hans von Bora konnte sich darauf nicht halten. Seine Schwester Katharina aber hatte nicht nur eine große Sehnsucht nach eigenem Grundbesiz, sondern sie fühlte sich auch hingezogen zur Stätte ihrer Kindheit. Als darum Kätthes Bruder in der Woche vor Pfingsten des Jahres 1540 in Wittenberg war, wurde der geplante Kauf vollzogen. Da das Kaufgeld 610 Gulden betrug und die Kasse bei Luther sehr schwach bestellt war, gab der Kurfürst 600 Gulden, wie er denn auch weitere Unterstützung durch Lieferung von Bauholz gab, da das Gütchen ziemlich heruntergewirtschaftet war und besonders die Gebäulichkeiten dringend der Reparatur bedurften. So kamen Luther und Kätthe in den Besiz von Zilsdorf, das dann in den letzten Jahren des Reformators eine ziemlich Rolle spielte. Das Gütchen bestand, wie Kroker meint, wohl nur aus dem Herrenhause, dem Stall, einer Scheune und einigen Drescherhäuschen. Aber Kätthe versprach sich viel von ihrem Unternehmen.

Luther scheint nicht mit besonderem Enthusiasmus an den Kauf= handel gegangen zu sein; aber er legte seiner Hausfrau auch keine Hindernisse in den Weg, da er sehr viel von ihrer Energie hielt. Schon am 2. Juli 1540 schrieb er einen launigen Brief von Weimar aus, den er mit der Anrede begann: „Gnade und Friede. Liebe Jungfrau Kätthe, gnädige Frau von Zilsdorf, und wie E. G. mehr heißt.“ (XXIb, 2485.) Ein Brief vom 16. Juli, von Eisenach aus geschrieben, hat einen ähn= lichen Klang: „Meiner gnädigen Jungfer Katharin Lutherin von Bora

und Zülzdorf gen Wittenberg, meinem Liebchen. . . . Schreibe mir auch einmal, ob du alles kriegest hast, das ich dir gesandt. . . . Hiermit Gott befohlen. Amen. Und laß die Kinder beten.“ (Kol. 2490.) Als er zehn Tage später meinte, Kätthe könne für den Sommer nach Zülzdorf übersiedelt sein, schrieb er ihr, ebenfalls aus Eisenach, einen Brief mit der scherzhaften Überschrift: „Der reichen Frauen zu Zülzdorf, Frauen Doctorin Katherin Lutherin, zu Wittenberg leiblich wohnhaftig und zu Zülzdorf geistlich wandelnd, meinem Liebchen zu Handen. . . . Ich bin nicht gewiß gewesen, ob dich diese Briefe zu Wittenberg oder zu Zülzdorf würden finden; sonst wollte ich geschrieben haben von mehr Dingen.“ (Kol. 2502.)

Trotzdem Kätthe gerne recht bald nach Zülzdorf gezogen wäre, konnte sie den Umzug nicht vor November des Jahres 1540 beverksstelligen. Etwa um diese Zeit, am 10. November 1540, schrieb Luther an Spalatin, besonders wegen eines Versprechens des Kurfürsten, daß sie Holz aus dem großen Walde östlich von Altenburg haben könne, „sonderlich starke Eichenstämme . . . , damit nicht (wie es oft vorfällt) Verdruß da sei über das von dem gütigen Fürsten erlangte Geschenk, welches man, verderbt durch die Böswilligkeit der Beamten, in Empfang nehmen muß. . . . Zugleich hat sie darum gebeten, wenn es dem Schöpfer gefällig wäre, möchte sie, daß von ihm die Abschnitte der Bäume gekauft würden . . . , die stärkeren Zweige. . . . Diese wollte sie als Feuerholz gebrauchen in ihrem neuen Reiche Zülzdorf. Aber da du alles besser weißt, als ich es verstehe, so wirst du alles sehr getreulich ausrichten. Es wird gegeben werden muß, was gegeben werden muß, damit wir die neue Königin in ihr Reich einsetzen.“ (Kol. 2529.)

Obgleich Kätthe sich bei dieser Gelegenheit nicht lange in Zülzdorf aufhielt, befürchtete Luther größere Ausgaben, wie das ja bei der Einrichtung eines neuen Hauswesens nicht anders zu erwarten war. Er schrieb am 7. Dezember an Melanchthon: „Mein Herr Kätthe grüßt euch, aber sie ist abwesend in ihrem neuen Reiche und verschwendet in diesem Jahre das, was erworben ist.“ (Kol. 2539.) Im Frühjahr des Jahres 1541 war die Gutsbesitzerin wieder in Zülzdorf, denn Luther schrieb am 20. Mai an Ehrenfried vom Ende zu Wolfenbürg: „Meine liebe Kätthe läßt euch bitten, und ich bitte für sie, weil sie eine neue Haushälterin worden zu Zülzdorf, und von hinnen ferne gelegen, ihr wollet ihr diese nachbarliche Freundschaft tun und 12 Scheffel Korn und 24 Hasern leihen; das will sie euch redlich wiedergeben nach der Dresche, so nächstkünftig.“ (Kol. 2602.) Im Sommer und im Herbst war Kätthe wieder auf ihrem Gut, denn Luther schrieb ihr am 18. September einen Brief, der auf drohende Gefahren hinweist und sie auffordert, bald nach Wittenberg zurückzukehren: „Meiner lieben Hausfrauen Kätthe Ludern von Bora zu Handen. Gnade und Friede. Liebe Kätthe! . . . Verkaufe und bestelle, was du kannst, und komme heim. Denn als mich's ansiehst, so will's Dreck regnen, und unsere Sünde will Gott heimsuchen durch seines

Zornes Ruten.“ (Kol. 2650.) Daß Rätke eine Woche später wieder in Wittenberg war, ergibt sich aus einem Briefe Luthers an Anton Lauterbach, worin er auch Grüße von seiner „Herrin“ bestellt und zugleich das Maß der Badestube angibt, die er damals in seiner Wohnung bauen ließ.

Allerdings hatte Luther auch mit dem Gute Jülsdorf allerlei Verdruß. Die Eichenstämme, die der Kurfürst versprochen hatte, wurden im nächsten Jahre, 1541, gefällt, gelangten aber durch ein Versehen in andere Hände, so daß Luther sich am 12. Januar 1542 bei Spalatin, der damals Pfarrer zu Altenburg war, bitterlich beklagte: „Alles, was diese räuberischen Amtsleute uns Theologen übergeben sollen, halten sie für gänzlich verloren. . . . Ich würde in der That nach dem Feste der Geburt Christi mein eigenes Fuhrwerk geschickt haben, das den ganzen Monat hindurch einen Stamm nach dem andern nach Jülsdorf fahren sollte. Was soll ich jetzt tun? Wie kann ich hoffen, daß mir in Zukunft andere Bäume geschenkt werden, ohne daß der Fürst darum weiß, oder mir auch von neuem ebenso gute zugesteht?“ (Kol. 2703.) Durch Spalatins Verwendung wurde das Versäumnis wieder gutgemacht, allerdings nach einem weiteren ersten Briefe Luthers (Kol. 2770), so daß Luther am 29. August 1542 an Spalatin schreiben konnte: „Morgen wird meine Rätke nach Jülsdorf reisen, wo ihr Fuhrwerk die Stämme hinbringen wird, und, so Gott will, andere Dinge ausrichten.“ (Kol. 2786.) Im Januar 1543 waren die Pferde wieder in Jülsdorf und im November 1543 zum drittenmal, weil immer noch elf Stämme im Walde lagen und vierundzwanzig weitere zu fällen waren; aber schließlich wurde alles in Ordnung gebracht, und Rätke konnte mit den meisten ihrer Nachbarn in bestem Einvernehmen leben. Nicht so gut ging es ihr aber in ihrem Verhältnis zu dem Rittergute Kierisch, dessen Besitzer als Guts herrschaft Ansprüche auf Frondienste erhoben. Doch wurde diese Angelegenheit in Ordnung gebracht, wenigstens zeitweilig, wie das aus einem Briefe Luthers an den Kurfürsten Johann Friedrich vom 26. März 1542 hervorgeht: „Erstlich danke ich untertäniglich E. C. F. G. für das Urtheil, so E. C. F. G. haben lassen gehen zwischen meiner Rätken und denen zu Kierisch; denn es gefällt uns das Urtheil wohl, und hätten in der Güte wohl mehr um Friede und guter Nachbarschaft willen eingeräumt.“ (Kol. 2733.) Leider hielt das gute Verhältnis nicht allzulange an; denn nach Luthers Tode begann das Prozeßsieren mit den Herren von Kierisch von neuem.

Wie oben erwähnt, reiste Rätke am 30. August 1542 nach Jülsdorf, blieb jedoch nur einige Tage dort, denn Magdalene Luther war bereits am 6. September so krank, daß der Vater einen Wagen nach Torgau sandte, um seinen ältesten Sohn Johannes nach Hause zu bringen, wie das aus einem Briefe an den Schullehrer Markus Grobel hervorgeht. Magdalene starb am 20. September, und Luther wurde durch diesen Tod auf das tiefste erschüttert, wie er in einem Briefe vom 23. September an Justus Jonas schreibt. In den darauffolgenden Monaten verlor er aber

das Gut Zilsdorf nicht aus den Augen, denn er schrieb am 10. November an Spalatin: „Mein Herr Rätthe dankt dir für den Zettel. Sie hat auch andere, zu denen sie diesen gelegt hat, um dereinst zu sehen, wie alles herbeigeschafft wird. [Rätthe hatte nämlich beabsichtigt, aus den geschnittenen Baumstämmen Bretter für eine zu errichtende Scheune schneiden zu lassen.] Unterdessen ist für uns deine Treue genugsam, welche nicht leiden wird, daß wir betrogen werden von diesen Raubvögeln, welche die Verwaltung haben.“ (Kol. 2801.) Am 4. Januar 1543 erwähnt Luther in einem Briefe an Spalatin die Tatsache, daß seinerseits alles getan worden sei, um die Angelegenheit mit den Baumstämmen in Ordnung zu bringen: „Mein Herr Rätthe schickt einen Wagen, um die übrigen Bäume abzufahren, wie du weißt. Sie bittet dich sehr, du wollest dich nicht beschwert finden, wenn deine Hilfe oder dein Rat vonnöten sein sollte.“ (Kol. 2830.) Zum letztenmal werden die leidigen Bäume erwähnt in einem Briefe an Spalatin vom 23. November 1543: „übrigens bittet dich mein Herr Rätthe, daß, wenn meinen Dienstleuten deine Hilfe oder Rat vonnöten sein sollte, du dich nicht beschwert finden wollest. Denn sie sendet ihre Pferde und Wagen, um die übrigen Bäume abzufahren.“ (Kol. 2932.) Allerdings konnte Rätthe damals nicht fertig bringen, was sie auszurichten hoffte, da das Wetter ihr einen Strich durch die Rechnung machte: „Mein Herr Rätthe hatte ihre Wagen und Pferde in Zilsdorf, aber sie kehrten getäuscht zurück, da sie vor Schneefall nichts ausrichten konnten. Daher schickt sie dieselben wiederum und wird dafür sorgen, daß das geschehe, was sie will; aber möge nur unterdessen der Weg nicht Ruhe haben und frei sein von dem Erleiden des Hufschlags der Pferde und der Reife der Räder.“ Dies am 10. Dezember 1543. (Kol. 2930.)

Früh im nächsten Jahr hat Luther Anton Lauterbach, Pfarrer in Pirna, daß er ihm etwa zehn Schock „Weinpfähle“ schicken wolle sowie auch Seplinge von roten Äpfeln, die ihm sehr gefallen zu haben scheinen; aber es geht aus seinem Briefe nicht hervor, ob er diese für einen der Wittenberger Gärten oder für Zilsdorf begehrte. (Kol. 2962.) Es scheint, daß Luther im Mai dieses Jahres persönlich in Zilsdorf war, denn in einem Briefe vom 23. Mai an Nikolaus Amsdorf erwähnt er beiläufig: „Ich habe beschlossen, durch das Gebiet unsers Fürsten zu gehen, nämlich über Grimma und Borna. Wenn nun von Borna aus (denn dem ist mein Gütlein Zilsdorf ganz nahe) die Reise bis nach Zeitz gehen sollte . . . , werde ich es dir von dem Orte aus anzeigen.“ (Kol. 2986.) Daß Rätthe damals wahrscheinlich nicht in Zilsdorf war, ergibt sich aus einem Briefe Luthers an Lauterbach vom 20. Juni, wo wir das Nachwort finden: „Meine Rätthe sendet das Maß für den Pelzrock des Töchterleins [Margarete], damit du dafür sorgst, daß er so passend wie möglich angefertigt werde.“ (Kol. 3001.)

Von sonderlichem Interesse in der Besprechung von Luthers Verhältnis zu dem Gute Zilsdorf ist ein Brief, den er am 28. Juli 1545

von Zeit aus an seine Hausfrau schrieb: „Ich wollt's gerne so machen, daß ich nicht dürft' wieder gen Wittenberg kommen. Mein Herz ist erkaltet, daß ich nicht gern mehr da bin, wollt' auch, daß du verkauftest Garten und Hufe, Haus und Hof; so wollt' ich M. G. S. das große Haus [das Schwarze Kloster] wieder schenken und wäre dein Bestes, daß du dich gen Zülzdorf setztest, weil ich noch lebe, und könnte dir mit dem Solde wohl helfen, das Gütlin zu bessern, denn ich hoffe, M. G. S. soll mir den Sold folgen lassen, zum wenigstens ein Jahr meins letzten Lebens. Nach meinem Tode werden dich die vier Elemente zu Wittenberg doch nicht wohl leiden; darum wäre es besser bei meinem Leben getan, was denn zu tun sein will. Vielleicht wird Wittenberg, wie sich's anläßt, mit seinem Regiment nicht St. Veits Tanz noch St. Johannis Tanz, sondern den Bettlertanz oder Beelzebubs Tanz kriegen, wie sie angefangen, die Frauen oder Jungfrauen zu blöhen hinten und bornen, und niemand ist, der da strafe oder wehre, und wird Gottes Wort dazu gespottet. Nur weg und aus dieser Sodoma. . . Will also umherschweifen und ehe das Bettelbrot essen, ehe ich meine armen letzten Tage mit dem unordigen Wesen zu Wittenberg martern und verunruhigen will, mit Verlust meiner sauren, teuren Arbeit. Magst solches (wo du willst) D. Pomer und Mag. Philipps wissen lassen, und ob D. Pomer wollt' hiemit Wittenberg von meinenwegen gesegnen; denn ich kann des Jorns und Unlusts nicht länger leiden.“ (Kol. 3125 f.)

Dieser Brief rief in Wittenberg eine solch große Bestürzung hervor, daß sowohl der Rat wie die Universität sofort Schritte taten, Luther von seinem Vorhaben abzubringen. Wie ihnen dies gelang, zeigt eine Nachschrift eines Briefes, den die Universität an den Kurfürsten Johann Friedrich am 1. August 1545 richtete. Wir erfahren da: „Auf dies Schreiben hat der fromme Kurfürst nicht geantwortet, sondern zu Luthero vornehme Räte und andere abgesandt und ihn zu sich gegen Torgau gnädigst erfordern lassen. Und weil die Universität daneben auch eine ehrliche Botschaft an ihn abgefertiget, hat er sich als ein Vater von seinen Kindern erbitten und bereden lassen und zu Wittenberg seine letzte Arbeit in Genesin, daran er zehn Jahr mit höchstem Fleiß gearbeitet, am 17. November zu Ende gebracht und mit diesen Worten beschlossen: „Ich kann nicht mehr, ich bin schwach. Orate Deum pro me, bittet Gott für mich, daß er mir ein gutes seliges Stündlein verleihe.“ (Kol. 3129.) Luthers beabsichtigter Weggang aus Wittenberg wird auch am 3. August in einem Brief von Kanzler Brück besprochen. (Kol. 3131.) Hierher gehört auch der Brief des Kurfürsten, den er am 5. August an Luther schrieb, der durch D. Rabeberger persönlich abgeliefert wurde. Am 18. August kehrte Luther wieder nach Wittenberg zurück, wie er an Nikolaus von Amstdorf berichtete.

Um diese Zeit bekam Rätke Luther Lust, sich noch ein weiteres Gut zu erwerben, nämlich das Gütlein Wachschorf; aber das Unternehmen scheiterte an dem Widerstand Kanzler Brücks, dem Rätke Luther aus

irgendeinem Grunde nicht sympathisch war. In einem Briefe vom 18. Dezember 1545 an den Kurfürsten bemerkt er: „Aus untertänigem Vertrauen mag ich E. E. F. G. nicht bergen, daß ich Sorg' hab', weil sich Doktor Martinus, in mehr denn in einem Weg wider den Hof bewegt, vermerken läßt. Es muß nochmals das Gütlein Wachschorf dahinter stecken und daß der gute, fromme Herr durch die Rippe [nämlich durch seine Frau] bewegt wird.“ (Kol. 3169 f.) Was dagegen Zülzdorf anlangt, so war dies Gütlein in Luthers Gedanken bis an das Ende seines Lebens. Die Anrede an seine Frau in einem Brief vom 1. Februar 1546 von Eisleben aus lautet: „Meiner herzlichsten Hausfrauen Katharin Lutherin, Doktorin, Zülzdorferin, Säumärkterin und was sie mehr sein kann.“ (Kol. 3191.) Und wie er in diesem Briefe so manche Vorgänge in seiner scherzhaften Weise beschreibt, so gilt dasselbe auch von andern Briefen aus Eisleben, sogar von seinem zweitletzten an seine Ehefrau, datiert den 10. Februar 1546, wo er sie anredet als „die heilige, sorgfältige Frau, Katharin Luther, Doktorin, Zülzdorferin, zu Wittenberg.“ Das Wort „sorgfältig“ in dieser Anrede war von Luther mit Absicht gewählt, nämlich wegen der Sorge seiner Frau um sein Wohlergehen, die Luther dann auch in seinem Briefe in launiger Weise, aber mit Hinweis auf den Schutz Gottes geißelt: „Ich Sorge, wo du nicht aufhörest zu sorgen, es möchte uns zuletzt die Erde verschlingen und alle Element verfolgen. Lehrest du also den Katechismus und den Glauben? Bete du und laß Gott sorgen; es heißt: ‚Wirf dein Anliegen auf den Herrn, der sorget für dich‘, Ps. 55, 23 und viel mehr Orten.“ (Kol. 3198.) Nur noch einen Brief schrieb Luther an seine Hausfrau, am 14. Februar. Sie hat ihn lebendig weder in Zülzdorf noch in Wittenberg wiedergesehen. Am 18. Februar starb der teure Mann im Glauben an seinen Erlöser, und am 22. Februar wurde sein entseelter Leichnam in Wittenberg beigelegt.

Luther hatte sein Testament am 6. Januar 1542 aufgesetzt, und dieses wurde am 11. April 1546 auf Ansuchen seiner Witwe vom Kurfürsten Johann Friedrich bestätigt. In diesem Testament äußert sich Luther, wie folgt: „Ich, M. L. D., bekenne mit dieser meiner eigenen Unterschrift, daß ich meiner lieben und treuen Hausfrau Katharin gegeben habe zum Leibgeding (oder wie man das nennen kann) auf ihr Leben lang, damit sie ihres Gefallens und zu ihrem Besten gebahren möge, und gebe ihr das in Kraft dieses Briefs, gegenwärtiges und heutiges Tages: Nämlich das Gütlein Zülzdorf, wie ich dasselbe gekauft und zugerichtet habe, allerdings, wie ich's bis daher gehabt habe. . . . Das tue ich darum, Ersichtlich, daß sie mich als ein fromm, treu, ehrlich Gemahl allezeit lieb, wert und schön gehalten und mir durch reichen Gottesseggen fünf lebendige Kinder (die noch vorhanden, Gott geb' lange) geboren und erzogen hat.“ (Kol. 2696.) Dies ist gewiß ein herrliches Zeugnis für Käthe sowohl wie für Luther.

P. E. K r e h m a n n.

fold), Creed, Anointing, Imposition of Hands. It seems quite clear that at that time the formula of Baptism was still in a state of flux.

The last two witnesses also seem to have the *baptismus adultorum* in mind. The formula in this case was influenced by the various rites employed in the admission of adult candidates, or catechumens, to the Christian congregation. While the candidates for membership attended the classes for instruction, they passed through a number of stages in the course of which they were obliged to submit to various *scrutinia*, among which we find the *impositio manuum*, the *oratio super electos*, the *gustus salis*, the Ephphatha ceremony, the *abrenuntiatio*, and finally the *symbolum*, or the confession of the Creed. The formula of Baptism finally included: *Benedictio Fontis, Consecratio Fontis, Signum Crucis, Demissio Cerei in Aquam, Infusio de Chrismate, Symbolum, Immersio, Signatio in Cerebro de Chrismate, Datio Spiritus Septiformis, Signatio in Fronte*. It was not long before the ceremonies of the catechumenate were combined with those of Baptism, the first group, including the exorcism, taking place *ad ianuas ecclesiae*, or in the atrium, and the second group, with Baptism proper, inside the church.

Now, it is a significant fact, well in keeping with the conservative nature of liturgics, that, when the *baptismus parvulorum* became the rule rather than the exception, *the rite, as intended chiefly for adults, was employed for children with only very slight adjustments*, chiefly such as pertained to the Scripture-passages quoted. Generally speaking, in the *Ordo ad Baptizandum Pueros* the following parts of the formula were used at the doors of the church: Inquiry after Name, Small, or Minor, Exorcism, Sign of Cross and Prayer, Giving of Salt and the *Pax* with Prayer, Large Exorcism, the Lessons, *Pater-noster* with *Ave Maria* and the Apostolic Creed, Ephphatha Ceremony, Entrance into Church; and the remaining ceremonies in the church, at the font: Renunciation, Creed, Anointing, Admonition to Sponsors, Baptism itself, Prayer of Thanksgiving, Clothing in Chrisom, or White Robe. Other ceremonies were found in a few localities, such as placing a lighted taper into the hands of the baptized child.

When Luther began his reformatory labors, also in the field of liturgics, he followed his customary conservative course. His *Tauf-buechlein, verdeutscht*, of 1523 was practically a translation of the Liturgy of Baptism then in use in Wittenberg. After further efforts along the same lines he finally furnished a formula in German, which discarded all the ceremonies that in any way savored of superstition. This order included: Small Exorcism, Sign of the Cross with Prayer for Mercy and "Flood" Prayer, Large Exorcism, Lesson from Mark, Lord's Prayer, Ingression (to baptismal font), Renunciation and Creed, Act of Baptism, Putting on of Chrisom, Final Prayer.

Most of the Lutheran church orders adopted Luther's form of

Our Formula for Infant Baptism.

It is a well-known fact that the oldest liturgies and forms for occasional acts cannot be traced back beyond the beginning of the second century. If there were written forms in use at that time, they have either disappeared entirely or must be constructed from the oldest extant liturgies together with the accounts of the Apostolic Fathers, the early apologists, and the Greek and Latin Fathers before Nicaea. Another source of information is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which are usually offered with the so-called *Apostolic Canons*, although in this case it seems quite evident that we are dealing with a codification of church formulas and rites which are the result of a gradual accretion, so that the determination of the nucleus or earliest form of a service or rite is not an easy matter.

In the case of the rite of Holy Baptism the study of the question is complicated by the fact that the rite of confirmation and that of Baptism ordinarily came together, since this was the ordinary form of admission to membership in the Christian Church. We have good reasons, of course, for assuming that the baptism of infants was not the exception, even in the early Church, for children who were born of Christian parents. We have statements from Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, Lib. II), from Origen (*In Ep. ad Rom.*), and from the Council of Carthage of 253 (*Ep. ad Fidum*), which clearly declare that Baptism was administered even to infants. But we have no account of the actual form of such baptism. The *Didache* merely states: Concerning Baptism, baptize thus: Having first rehearsed all these things, 'baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' in running water; but if thou hast no running water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water three times on the head 'in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit.'" (Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 319 f.) The account of Justin Martyr also describes a very simple rite: "Then they are brought to a place where there is water, and [they] are regenerated in the same manner as we also were regenerated. For in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe and of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Holy Ghost they can receive Baptism with water." (*First Apology*, chap. 61.) In either case the author seems to refer to the baptism of adults, though this conclusion is not absolutely required. Two other witnesses of the ante-Nicene period may be mentioned, namely, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which give the following parts of the baptismal formula: Renunciation, Creed, Anointing, Benediction of Water, Act of Baptism, Imposition of Hands, Lord's Prayer, Prayer of Thanksgiving; and Tertullian, who names the following ceremonies of Baptism: Invocation of the Holy Ghost and Benediction of Water, Renunciation, Immersion (three-

1526. Its influence was immeasurable. The numerous independent *Kirchenordnungen* of the sixteenth century, almost without exception and with but the slightest changes, give it as their form for the administration of the Sacrament. The same is true of practically every agenda that makes any claim to Lutheranism. Even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the disposition was just as strong to cling to the form which Luther had adapted from an order depending upon the most ancient sources. The Dresden Liturgical Convention of 1854, composed of representatives from Bavaria, Hanover, Wurttemberg, and both Mecklenburgs, unanimously adopted Luther's form. Even the Prussian Union Church in 1894 adopted this as its first form. In only one major point do we find a divergence, namely, concerning the questions addressed to the sponsors. Some few church orders omitted these questions entirely, the formula addressing itself directly to the child, while in a number of cases there was some uncertainty as to whether the questions as used ought to be addressed to the sponsors or to the child. Minor differences pertain to the motivation included in the opening paragraphs of the formula.

It is this last point which has caused some discussion during recent years, the contention being that our present formula of Baptism presents too much evidence of having originally been used for adults and that for this reason the motivation and argumentation is in part inadequate. Accordingly a tendency is noticeable which inclines not only toward an abbreviation of the baptismal formula as given in our *Agenda*, but also toward other alterations in the text. If this is done without the proper liturgical information, the result may be a loss in uniformity in the form of Baptism that may eventually cause an even greater *skandalon* than the practise of disfiguring our Common Service by unwarranted additions, abbreviations, and transpositions. And yet our Synod in its constitution states as one of its objects: "The endeavor to bring about the largest possible uniformity in church practise, church customs, and, in general, in congregational affairs."

On the other hand, there is no denying the fact that justified, constructive criticism ought to be given a hearing; for there is no justification for stubbornly adhering to a traditional formula just because it is ancient and contains no outright false statements. Hence we ask, What must a formula, such as that used for the Sacrament of Baptism for children, include in order to be liturgically acceptable? The following points may be considered requisites for a complete formula: Motivation, or reasons, for administering the Sacrament, specific doctrinal basis for Baptism in general and for infant baptism in particular, the act itself in full conformity with the words of Christ's institution, acceptance of the baptized infant into the Church.

The first point is the *motivation*, the reference to the Word of

God and the specific command and promise of Christ as connected with Holy Baptism. This is a very prominent feature in the introductory section of all Lutheran formulas. The second point is the *specific doctrinal basis*, particularly for infant baptism. In this respect Luther's liturgies are models, for they make the most emphatic distinction between sin and grace, between the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of the Savior. It will require only a sentence or two to make the application of these truths to infants as being likewise included in the blessings of the Sacrament. The third point is essential from the standpoint of doctrine and liturgies both, since without the word of God, the words of Christ's institution, the water is simple water and no Baptism, whereas with the word of God it is a Baptism. And the fourth point is implied, if not actually stated, in the final prayer of the formula, in which the acceptance of the newly baptized child into the congregation, and therewith into the Church, is directly asserted.

In keeping with these liturgical principles and with a proper observance of liturgical conservatism it may be possible to retain the ancient formula with just a few minor changes. With such minor alterations the formula for infant baptism would present the following appearance:—

Part I.

(At the lowest chancel step [instead of *ad ianuas*].)

Dearly Beloved: [We learn from the Word of God that all men since the fall of Adam are conceived and born in sin and so are under the wrath of God and therefore would be lost forever unless delivered from death and damnation by our Lord Jesus Christ.

This present child also is by nature sinful and under the wrath of God. But the Father of all grace and mercy hath promised and sent His Son Jesus Christ, who hath borne the sins of the whole world and therefore redeemed and saved little children, no less than others, from sin, death, and everlasting condemnation. He also commanded that little children should be brought to Him and graciously received and blessed them.

Wherefore I beseech you, for the love which you bear to Christ, to intercede for *this child*, to bring *him* to the Lord Jesus, and to ask for *him* the forgiveness of sins and the grace and salvation of Christ's kingdom, nowise doubting that our dear Lord favorably regardeth such work of love and certainly heareth our prayers.

And] Forasmuch as our Lord hath commanded Baptism, saying to His disciples in the last chapter of Matthew: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," and also hath given promise in the last chapter of Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"; forasmuch, also, as the holy apostles of the Lord have written: "The promise is unto you and to your children" and again: "Baptism doth also now save us": it is meet and right that, in obedience to His command and institution and trusting in His promise, you should bring *this child* to be baptized in His name.

(Then the Minister may make the sign of the cross on the child's forehead and on the breast, saying: —)

Receive the sign of the holy cross both upon thy forehead † and upon thy breast †, in token that thou hast been redeemed by Christ the Crucified.

Let us pray (one or more of the following prayers may be used):

1.

Almighty and eternal God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we pray Thee, bestow upon *this child*, here presented for Holy Baptism, Thine everlasting grace by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. Receive *him*, O Lord, according to Thy Word and promise and grant that *he* may obtain the everlasting blessing of this heavenly washing and come to the kingdom which Thou hast promised; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

2.

Lord, holy Father, almighty, eternal God, from whom cometh down every good gift and every perfect gift with the light of Thy truth, we pray Thy merciful goodness that Thou wouldest bestow Thy blessing upon *this child*, here presented for Holy Baptism, that *he* may be enlightened with the light of Thy knowledge unto eternal salvation. Purify and sanctify *him*, give *him* the right understanding, that *he* may be made worthy of receiving the grace of Thy Baptism and that *he* may have the firm hope of final redemption through faith in Thy promises; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

3.

Almighty and everlasting God, who according to Thy righteous judgment didst destroy the unbelieving world by the Flood and according to Thy great mercy didst save faithful Noah and his family; who didst drown obdurate Pharaoh with all his host in the Red Sea and didst safely lead Thy people Israel through the midst thereof, prefiguring thereby this washing of Thy Holy Baptism; and who by the baptism of Thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, didst sanctify and ordain Jordan and all waters for a saving flood and an abundant washing away of sin: we beseech Thee of Thine infinite mercy to look with favor upon *this child* and to bless *him* by Thy Spirit with true faith that by this salutary flood there may be drowned and destroyed in *him* all that *he* hath inherited from Adam (and *himself* added thereto) and that, being separated from the number of unbelieving, *he* may be securely kept in the holy ark of the Christian Church and ever serve Thy name with fervent spirit and joyful hope, to the end that, together with all believers, *he* may be accounted worthy to attain to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

(The Lesson.)

Hear the holy Gospel of St. Mark, which saith: "And they brought young children to Jesus that He should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, He was much displeased and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them

up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them." (Mark 10, 13—16.)

In order that our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost, may graciously receive *this present child*, take *him* up in His arms, put His blessed hands upon *him*, and endow *him* with the Holy Ghost, true faith, and a pious life, we shall now present *this child* to Him in devotion and faith by the prayer which He Himself taught His disciples.

(Then the Minister, laying his right hand upon the head of the child,—or of the several children in order,—shall say, and the sponsors and all those present may say with him:—)

Our Father who art in heaven; Hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; Give us this day our daily bread; And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us; And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil; For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever and ever. Amen.

The Lord preserve thy coming in and thy going out from this time forth and even forevermore. † Amen.

* * *

(Admonition to the Sponsors.)*

Dear Christian Friends: It is expected of you as sponsors, in acting for *the child* here presented for Holy Baptism, while confessing in this sacred act the faith of the Christian Church in the Triune God, in whose name *the child* is to be baptized, to bear witness publicly in *the child's* stead that by Holy Baptism as a means of grace *he* obtains and possesses the saving faith in the one true God and renounces the devil and his wicked works. Moreover, after *this child* has been baptized, you should at all times remember *him* in your prayers, put *him* in mind of *his* baptism, and, as much as in you lies, lend your counsel and aid (especially if *he* should lose *his* parents) that *he* may be brought up in the true knowledge and fear of God, according to the teachings of the Lutheran Church, and faithfully keep the baptismal covenant unto the end. Do you intend gladly and willingly to do so?

Answer: Yes.

May God enable you both to will and to do this charitable work and with His grace fulfil what we are unable to do! Amen.

Part II.

(At the font.)

Dear Christian Friends and Sponsors: Since you, in this sacred act, are representing *the child* here presented for Holy Baptism, I ask you to answer, in the name and in the stead of *this child*, the questions which I shall now address to *him*, to signify thereby what God in and through Baptism works in *him*.

(Then shall the Minister say:—)

N., Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works and all his ways?

Answer: I do.

* This admonition may be read either here, at the end of the first part of the formula, or after the introductory paragraphs, or, with slight changes in wording, at the close of the entire act.

Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?

Answer: I do.

Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord; Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; Born of the Virgin Mary; Suffered unto Pontius Pilate; Was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; The third day He rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven; And sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead?

Answer: I do.

Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost; The holy Christian Church, the communion of saints; The forgiveness of sins; The resurrection of the body; And the life everlasting?

Answer: I do.

Wilt thou be baptized into this Christian faith?

Answer: I will.

(Then shall the Minister apply water three times upon the head of the child—or each child in order—as he names each person of the Trinity:—)

N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. † Amen.

(Then the Minister, still at the font, shall lay his right hand upon the head of the child—or of each child in order—and shall say:—)

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten thee again of water and the Spirit and hath forgiven thee all thy sins, strengthen thee with His grace unto life everlasting. Amen.

Peace be with thee. † Amen.

(While the sponsors with the child remain at the font, but within the chancel, the Minister shall step to the altar for the final prayer.)

Let us pray:—

Almighty and most merciful God and Father, we thank and praise Thee that Thou dost graciously preserve and extend Thy Church and hast granted to *this child* the new birth in Holy Baptism and made *him a member* of Thy dear Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and *an heir* of Thy heavenly kingdom. We humbly beseech Thee that, as *he* hath now become *Thy* child, Thou wouldst keep *him* in *his* baptismal grace, that, according to all Thy good pleasure, *he* may be faithfully brought up to lead a godly life to the praise and honor of Thy holy name and finally, with all Thy saints, obtain the promised inheritance in heaven; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

* * *

A final paragraph concerning the use and the significance of the formula of Baptism may not be superfluous. For one thing, the tendency to abbreviate the formula should not reach the stage where essential paragraphs pertaining to motivation or doctrine are omitted. If sponsors are at all available, the admonition to the sponsors ought to be included, otherwise this significant feature of Lutheran baptism may soon become an empty form. It should also be noted that the Apostles' Creed as used in the formula is not a prayer, but a confession of the child and hence should be spoken in the form of questions.

Since we have retained the essential features of the ancient baptism, the symbolism of the sacramental rite is best set forth if the division indicated above is observed. Part I, originally performed at the doors of the church to signify that the candidate desired admission into the congregation, ought to take place at the foot of the chancel steps. After the invitation the child is taken to the font, where Part II of the formula is used, whereby admission to the congregation (and to the Church) is accomplished. And the final prayer at the altar signifies that the child has now been accepted into membership in the Christian Church, on which account the special blessing of the Lord is invoked upon the new member of the body of Christ.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Divorce and Malicious Desertion.

III. Does Divorce on the Ground of Adultery Grant Permission for Remarriage?

The Church of Rome vehemently denies that adultery or fornication severs the marriage bond and grants permission for remarriage. The Council of Trent, in Session XXIV, "On the Sacrament of Matrimony," Canons VII and VIII, has declared as follows: "If any one saith that the Church has erred in that she hath taught, and doth teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties and that both or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other and that he is guilty of adultery who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband, — let him be anathema.

"If any saith that the Church errs in that she declares that for many causes a separation may take place between husband and wife in regard of bed or in regard of cohabitation for a determinate or for an indeterminate period, let him be anathema." (Translation by Waterworth, p. 193.)

The Church of England has never authoritatively sanctioned any other separation than that from bed and board, and this with an express prohibition of remarriage, Canon 107. Keil, on Matt. 5, 32, says: "By *πορνεία* the bond of marriage, indissoluble according to divine ordinance, is severed, but the marriage is not dissolved before God, so that the divorced spouses might enter into other marriages without transgressing the divine ordinance. Chapter 19, 6 the Redeemer expressly declares: 'What God hath joined together let not man put asunder.' Only death can sever the marriage tie. During

the lifetime of the man who has dismissed his wife because of fornication not only the woman, but the man as well becomes guilty before God of adultery if they contract other marriages. For though Christ speaks here only of the man, yet according to the Christian conception of matrimony this word refers also to the woman, as Mark 10 teaches."

Let us take up some of the arguments of the opponents.

1. According to Keil only death severs marriage and grants permission for remarriage. We ask, Where does God say that death is the only cause? And where does God say that He Himself cannot make exceptions to His rules? He binds man, not Himself, to His Law, and Matt. 19, 9 Christ, the divine Lawgiver, Himself makes an exception to the rule that marriage is indissoluble.

2. Rome and the Church of England hold that adultery does not separate *a vinculo*, from the bond, or marriage tie, but merely *a thoro et mensa*, from bed and board. We maintain that the context proves that both the Pharisees and Christ had in mind a divorce which would permit another marriage. The Pharisees did not think of a mere separation *a thoro*; for, in the first place, it was the general custom for divorced people to enter upon a second and even a third marriage. And secondly, the passage from Deuteronomy which they quote clearly speaks of such a divorce as would give liberty to marry another. In fact, the divorce in the Biblical sense is a divorce which grants the liberty of remarriage. Cp. Lev. 21, 7, 14; Ezek. 44, 22; Jer. 3, 1. Christ has no other divorce in mind. He emphatically declares that every one who dismisses his wife and marries another commits adultery. It is evident that He has a divorce in mind for the purpose, at least with the liberty, of marrying another. He denies the legitimacy of such a divorce with one exception, and that is fornication. Hence fornication gives to the innocent party the right to divorce his spouse and marry another.

3. We are told "that the absence of the article from the word *apolelumenen*, 'her who is divorced,' in St. Matthew as well as in St. Mark and St. Luke takes away all ambiguity from the meaning. It can mean only one thing, not 'the' divorced woman, but 'a' divorced woman, *i. e.*, 'any' divorced woman." (Gwynne, *Divorce in America under State and Church*, p. 85, note 8.) Surely, he that marries any divorced woman commits adultery, except it be for fornication.

4. "So serious an exception (assuming that it allows remarriage) must have been *expressed, i. e.*, not merely left to inference." (Gwynne, *l. c.*, p. 85, quoting Bishop Gore, *Question of Divorce*, p. 23.) We hold that this very exception and assumption is expressed as clearly as it can be.

5. "In both passages the exception is *only grammatically (sic)* applicable to 'putting away.' It cannot possibly be applied to re-

marriage, for which we find in St. Matthew as elsewhere no allowance whatever, but, on the contrary, condemnation for both innocent and guilty." (Gwynne, p. 85.) We maintain that the context forbids the application of the exception to the putting away only; for, as we have seen, the divorce concerning which the Pharisees inquire and of which Christ speaks includes the right to marry. Moreover, we must consider that Christ lays down a rule and states an exception. If any one divorces his wife except for fornication and marries another, he commits adultery. Evidently this rule implies that, if the exception occurs, no adultery occurs. The rule evidently therefore implies that whosoever puts away his wife for fornication and marries another does not commit adultery. Who gives any one the right to omit the clause "and marrieth another" and make the rule imply that whosoever divorces his wife for fornication does not commit adultery, but he will commit adultery if he marries another? Is that not reading into Christ's word a sense which they cannot bear? Quite evidently it is logically impossible to apply the exception to the putting away only. *Speaker's Commentary* very aptly states: "The logical sequence is lost if the second clause is made more extensive than the first. The only consistent ground on which it can be maintained that marriage with a divorced person is always unlawful is the assumption that the previous divorce is always unlawful." (On Matt. 19, 9.) The exception is merely an anthesis. The rule reads in Matt. 5 and 19 just as it does in Luke 16 and Mark 10, only in Matthew an exception is made to the general rule.

6. Does not Rom. 7, 2 state that only death can separate a marriage, that consequently no divorce, even not a divorce for fornication, will permit remarriage? The points of comparison in this passage must not be overlooked. The apostle does not treat of divorce, but of death, as freeing from the law and illustrates that by the marriage law, which is no longer binding after death. Just so through the vicarious death of Christ, which is accounted to us as our death, we are free from the Law to which we were bound and may, and ought to be, married to Christ.

The hypocrisy and wickedness of the Roman Church is clearly shown in the prohibition of remarriage of a person divorced because of fornication. It prohibits marriage to a person to whom Christ has permitted it, even though he may not have the gift of continence and his conscience consequently may be burdened by his burning, 1 Cor. 7, 2, 9, yea, even though this prohibition may drive, and actually has driven, people into fornication and adultery. On the other hand, the Church of Rome pronounces the anathema on every one who dares to say that those degrees of consanguinity and affinity which are set down in Leviticus can hinder matrimony from being contracted and dissolve it when contracted and that the Church

cannot dispense in some of these degrees or establish that others may hinder and dissolve it (Session XXIV, Canon III); and again: "If any one saith that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage or that she has erred in establishing them, let him be anathema" (Canon IV). Compare also Canons VI and IX, which establish the solemn profession of religion or chastity as dissolving matrimony. The Church of Rome does not tolerate divorce. Perish the thought! But the door is wide open for separation because of impediments which make the marriage, even though contracted according to civic law, null and void upon grounds that the Church may establish. In this connection, Chemnitz makes the scathing, but true remark: "What does the Synod of Trent care for the conscience of man?"

In 1930, according to the *Catholic Gazette*, 53 matrimonial cases were considered by the Rota. Either in the first or second instance, 29 of them "*in forma pauperis*," i. e., by poor persons for whom an advocate was assigned by the Rota. In 14 cases out of the 53 a declaration of nullity was either rendered or confirmed (CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, II, p. 622). Rome still arrogates to itself the right to annul marriages at will.

May the guilty party marry another? In the Old Testament this question was needless, since both adulterer and adulteress were put to death. Capital punishment would indeed not be too severe a penalty for this most shameful breach of married love and troth. Since the Church has not the right to inflict temporal penalties, and since the government rarely punishes adultery by death, the question arises, May the Church permit the penitent adulterer to enter into another marriage, and may it acknowledge the marriage contracted by the adulterer prior to his repentance as legitimate? Opinions again vary. The question is not directly answered in the Word of God, but sufficient light is shed on this problem also. If the innocent party has made use of his right to divorce the adulterer, then the first marriage is severed before God. The relation of the two parties to each other is no longer that of husband and wife. The wife is free from the law of the husband, and the husband is free from the law of the wife, Rom. 7, 2. Not by death, to be sure, but by another cause, permitted by the Lord during the lifetime of both parties, a divorce because of adultery. Hence in analogy of Rom. 7, 3, which gives to the surviving spouse the right to remarry, both are permitted to marry whomsoever they will. Nor does the rule apply that whosoever marrieth him or her that is divorced committeth adultery. For here is a person whose former marriage was severed, not by a prohibited divorce, but by a divorce permitted and sanctioned by God Himself. He is without spouse just as surely as though his spouse had died, and hence his case is an exception to the rule which makes all divorces and subsequent marriages adulterous.

Ought not, however, the adulterer to be punished by prohibition of remarriage? The Church has no right to inflict temporal punishment upon him, least of all to forbid him to marry, 1 Cor. 7, 9; 1 Tim. 4, 1. 3. Gerhard advises that the guilty party be not permitted to hasten into a second marriage while the innocent party remains unmarried. Yet while the Church may advise that every effort be made toward reestablishing the severed union, it has not the right to insist that these steps be taken before the penitent adulterer is readmitted into membership or permitted to marry. After the innocent party has divorced him, the marriage has been severed in accordance with the Word of God, and there is no divine law prohibiting him from marrying whomsoever he will, even the person with whom he has committed adultery, always, of course, taking into consideration Lev. 18, 6. Naturally, if the State forbids the marriage of the adulterer to his partner in guilt, the Church will not permit such a marriage. To avoid offense, the advice is usually given that the adulterer do not marry and take up his residence in the place where his sin is known, especially if he marries the person with whom he has committed adultery. The Church, however, can hardly insist on this, since it has no right to inflict temporal penalties.

Hence there is no reason why we should not, on the strength of the word of Christ in Matt. 19, 9, permit remarriage to the innocent spouse. In the Old Testament the innocent party very evidently had the right to remarry. If the adulterer and adulteress had been put to death in accordance with Deut. 22, 22, then the union of the innocent spouse and his adulterous spouse was effectually severed, dissolved by the death penalty inflicted on the guilty spouse because of the adultery, and consequently the innocent spouse was free to marry whom he would.

The only ground therefore for obtaining a divorce, for severing an existing marriage, is that of fornication on the part of the other spouse. Whenever fornication cannot be proved, the man and the woman who by rightful betrothal have entered the state of matrimony must, according to the Word of God, remain indissolubly united until God Himself parts them by death.

Does not, however, Paul, after all, grant permission to separate even where fornication cannot be proved? Does he not grant a woman who for some reason or other no longer feels inclined to live with her husband, the right to choose between returning to him or remaining separated from him as long as she does not marry during the lifetime of her spouse? That is the view held by many; yet a closer study of the passage in question, 1 Cor. 7, 10, 11, will convince us that Paul is in full agreement with Christ in maintaining the indissolubility of the marriage tie. The passage reads, vv. 10, 11: "Unto the married I command [a], yet not I, but the Lord [b], Let not the

wife depart from her husband [c]. But and if she depart [a], let her remain unmarried [b] or be reconciled to her husband [c]; and let not the husband put away his wife [d]."

For the sake of convenience we have lettered the several clauses of vv. 10. 11.

10a. For the case coming under consideration, the separation of Christian spouses, the apostle does not merely advise, as he does vv. 6. 25, no, he commands, since in 10b this case is fully covered by clear words of the Lord (such as Gen. 2, 24; Matt. 5, 32; 19, 9; Mark 10, 11. 12; Luke 16, 18). This command of the Lord is brought out in 10c and 11d, the three clauses of v. 11, a, b, c, forming a parenthetical sentence, to be enclosed in brackets. The law for both spouses is identical, equally clear and unmistakable. The wife is not to depart from her husband, and the husband is not to put away his wife. This is the basic law laid down by Christ and accepted *in toto* by Paul: No divorce among Christians. The one exception granted by the Lord, Matt. 5, 32; 19, 9 (fornication), is not mentioned by the apostle, since fornication, and hence divorce because of fornication, ought not to occur among Christians.

However, the apostle realizes that Christians are not perfect. No sooner therefore had he written 10a than he added 11a, b, c: *Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρὶσθῇ*. Conditional sentences introduced by *ἐὰν* with the subjunctive are, according to Robertson, confined to the future (from the viewpoint of the speaker or writer). Cp. 1 Cor. 10, 28: *ἐὰν δέ τις ὑμῶν ἐσθῇ*, Mark 9, 43: "If thine hand offend thee," etc.

The apostle does not legislate on a case that had actually occurred in the congregation at Corinth. He merely assumes the possibility that for some reason, either in ignorance of the sinfulness of such a step or in a sudden fit of anger or in yielding to her impatience, a wife has run away from her husband. If this has occurred, the command of the apostle to such a woman is either to remain unmarried or to become reconciled to her husband. These words of the apostle, however, cannot possibly be construed as permitting the woman (or the husband, for the same law applies to both) who has left her husband or intends to do so to choose between returning to him or remaining separated from him, but unmarried. He would flatly contradict the command of the Lord, to whom he appeals and who permits no divorce save for the cause of fornication, and he would grossly contradict himself. He would grant permission to bring about what just a moment before he had forbidden and what in the very next moment he again prohibits, a separation of husband and wife. Compare also v. 5, where the cessation of conjugal cohabitation is permitted only "for a time," and for a very special reason, and the command added: "Come together again that Satan tempt you not." Therefore the evident meaning of these words is that the wife must

do one of two things, either remain unmarried or — *rather* — be reconciled, since the Lord permits no separation. For this use of *ñ* compare Acts 24, 18—20: "Certain Jews of Asia ought to have been here before thee and object if they had aught against me, or else let these same here say if they have found any evil doing in me." Ask the Jews from Asia, *ñ*, or rather, since that cannot be done because of their absence, let these men speak. In a similar manner *ñ* is used in our passage. Let her remain unmarried, or rather, since that cannot be done because of the divine prohibition of separation, let her become reconciled. Cp. Meyer on 1 Cor. 7, 11.

Why, then, does the apostle at all mention the duty of remaining unmarried? Simply because, above all, it was his purpose to prevent a hasty remarriage to another. She has separated, he means to say, but that does not give her the right to marry another. She is still the wife of her husband, and hence it is her duty, above all, to remain unmarried, or rather, since she is still the wife of a spouse and dare not separate from him, it is her duty to go back and reestablish her former relation as quickly as possible. The word *reconcile* here evidently does not merely mean the asking for forgiveness, but includes the resumption of the marital relation, since reconciliation is distinguished from remaining unmarried.

If the wife endeavors to reestablish marital relations with her husband, either of two possibilities will arise: either she is again accepted, and all is well, or, though she is making every effort to effect a reconciliation, she finds that the husband is unwilling to accept her. That fact alone gives her no right to cease her efforts at reconciliation or to marry some other man. She must remain unmarried and continue her efforts. However, such a husband, if he refuses to take back his legal wife, sins against 11d, must be subjected to church discipline and, if he remains impenitent, must be excommunicated, and then 1 Cor. 7, 15 applies to both parties. And if the wife persistently refuses to become reconciled, she must be dealt with in a similar manner.

There is therefore no disagreement between Paul and Christ.

TH. LAETSCH.

Die Hauptschriften Luthers in chronologischer Reihenfolge.

Mit Anmerkungen.

(Fortsetzung.)

1525. „Deutsche Messe und Ordnung des Gottesdienstes.“ — Diese Schrift trägt gewöhnlich das Datum 1526, weil sie in diesem Jahre tatsächlich auf dem Markt erschien. Aber Buchwald bemerkt: „Noch vor Weihnachten erscheint die ‚Deutsche Messe‘.“ Dies ist eine der Schriften, die jeder lutherische Liturg genau studieren sollte, da sie Luthers Ausführungen über die Grundsätze des christlichen Gottesdienstes enthält. Er gibt unter anderm eine kurze Definition einer Christi-

lichen Ortsgemeinde, redet ausführlich vom Gebrauch des Katechismus und gibt dann die Gottesdienstsordnung, zum Teil mit den in Wittenberg gebräuchlichen Melodien. Eine seiner Schlussbemerkungen ist es wohl wert, beherzigt zu werden: „Summa, dieser und aller Ordnung ist also zu gebrauchen, daß, wo ein Mißbrauch daraus wird, daß man sie flugs abtue und eine andere mache.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe X, 226—257.)

1525. *De Servo Arbitrio Mar. Lutheri ad D. Erasmus Roterodamum.* — Diese Schrift, in der deutschen Übersetzung gewöhnlich unter dem Titel „Daß der freie Wille nichts sei“ zitiert, hatte Luther schon am 27. September 1525 in Arbeit; am 30. Oktober hoffte er, sie in vierzehn Tagen zu beenden. Sie erschien tatsächlich Ende Dezember, und zwar zunächst lateinisch, gedruckt in Wittenberg von Hans Lust. Die erste deutsche Übersetzung wurde 1526 von Justus Jonas angefertigt. Diese Schrift hat Luther selber sehr hochgeschätzt und sie mit zu den besten gerechnet, die aus seiner Feder geflossen seien. Wie nicht anders zu erwarten, hält sich Luther ziemlich genau an die „Diatrobe“ des Erasmus, behandelt aber dabei in ausführlicher Weise viele der Grundwahrheiten der Schrift: die Klarheit der Schrift, die Unhaltbarkeit der Zwangsbeteuerung, den Monergismus, die Lehre von der Kirche und von der Gnadenwahl, die Wirksamkeit der Gnade Gottes. Im „Beschluß des ganzen Buches“ findet sich der Ausspruch Luthers, der so oft zitiert wird: *Inglulum meum petisti*. Ein genaues Studium dieser Schrift ist ein gutes Antidot gegen Synergismus. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVIII, 1668—1669.)

1526. „Das Papsttum mit seinen Gliedern abgemalt und beschrieben. Mit Luthers Vor- und Nachrede.“ — Diese Schrift erschien zu Neujahr 1526. Ihr corpus ist eine Serie von Reimen, die die päpstliche Hierarchie und die Mönchsorden beschreiben. Es sind im ganzen 57 Orden, die in diesen Knüttelversen charakterisiert werden, wozu noch ein Orden vom Fegfeuer kommt. Luthers Vorrede geißelt das Gaukelwerk der Hierarchie und der Orden, und seine Nachrede wendet Kol. 2, 16 ff. auf das Thema an. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XIX, 622—639.)

1526. „Der Prophet Jona ausgelegt.“ — Die ersten Vorlesungen Luthers über den Propheten Jona wurden wahrscheinlich im Februar 1525 gehalten, und zwar lateinisch. Eine deutsche Auslegung des Propheten wurde von Luther selbst besorgt. Sie erschien, soweit sich ermitteln läßt, im August des Jahres 1526, durch Michel Lotterus in Wittenberg gedruckt. Die Auslegung ist nach Lutherischer Weise ziemlich ausführlich, mit den üblichen praktischen Anwendungen auf damalige Verhältnisse. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XIV, 836—912. Es folgen dann die Vorlesungen von 1525, 912—971, nach zwei Handschriften.)

1526. „Wider den Ratschlag der ganzen Mainzischen Pfafferei; Unterricht und Warnung.“ — Anlaß zu dieser Schrift gab eine „heimliche Handlung“, in Mainz gehalten, wobei gewisse Feinde des Evangeliums beratschlagt haben, wie man die „lutherischen“ Länder mit Krieg überziehen und die lutherische Lehre ausrotten könne. Die Sache kam durch einen Adligen namens Rad an die Öffentlichkeit (daher die Pfaffen Händel). „Da ist Doktor Martinus Luther im Vorhaben gewesen, ein ernstes, scharfes Büchlein im Druck lassen auszugeben wider diese Mainzische Bündnis . . .; aber durch des Kurfürsten zu Sachsen Abschaffen ist das Büchlein hinterhalten und der einzelne gedruckte Bogen aus der Druckerei weggenommen.“ Die Riste von Vergewaltigungen, die Luther in seiner Handschrift anführt, zeigt, wie weit man damals schon in der Verfolgung der lutherischen Lehre gegangen war. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVI, 339—362.)

1526. „Antwort auf die . . . Artikel für die Klostergeißelbe.“ — Diese Schrift erschien im Mai 1526. Sie enthält eine kurze, aber scharfe und sachgemäße Kritik der falschen Auslegung von Sprüchen, die von den Papisten für ihre Mönchsgeißelbe angeführt werden. Am Ende der Schrift sagt Luther: „Im Kloster einsam im Winkel sitzen, das ist niemand dienen noch nütze sein und sich dem Teufel zu kigeln geben zu aller böser Lust, daß die Gedanken größer sind, denn aller Welt Lust ist.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe XIX, 1684—1693.) P. E. R e c h m a n n.

(Fortsetzung folgt.)

Dispositionen über die altkirchliche Epistelreihe.

Fünfter Sonntag nach Epiphania.

R o I. 3, 12—17.

Der Gemeindegesang war von Anfang an ein Hauptbestandteil des christlichen Gottesdienstes. Apost. 4, 24. Brief des Plinius an Trajan: er habe festgestellt, daß die Christen ein Lied zum Lobe ihres Gottes Christus miteinander sangen. Im Mittelalter war der Gemeindegesang allerdings fast ganz verstummt, aber durch die Reformation ist er wieder zu seinem vollen Rechte gekommen.

Wir singen in allen Gottesdiensten. Aber warum? Etwa nur weil es Sitte ist, ohne einen bestimmten Zweck im Auge zu haben?

Von dem Zweck unsers Gemeindegesangs.

1. Worin er besteht; 2. wie er erreicht wird.

1.

a. Gottesdienst. Durch ihren Gesang verherrlicht die Gemeinde ihren Gott: „Singet dem Herrn“, V. 16c; „danket Gott und dem Vater“, V. 17c; Eph. 5, 19 f. Nicht allein durch ihre Lob- und Danklieder, sondern auch durch ihre Gebetslieder. „Das ist der höchste Gottesdienst nach der Schrift, daß man Jesum Christum in allen Nöten und Anliegen von Herzen suche und annehme“ (Augsb. Konf., XXI).

b. Gemeinschaftliches Glaubensbekenntnis. „In einem Leibe“, V. 15. In ihren Liedern bekennet die Gemeinde nicht nur ihre Glaubenseinigkeit, sondern auch ihre Glaubenslehren. (Hinweis auf bekannte Lieder.) Dryander: „Mag die Predigt bisweilen über die Gemeinde dahingehen, daß man manches, was gesagt wird, sich nicht aneignen kann; mag darum in gewissem Sinne die Gemeinde sich dabei passiv verhalten: als eine singende Gemeinde ist sie selbst tätig, ist sie mitbekennend. Das Gesangbuch ist ein Bekenntnisbuch der Gemeinde.“

c. Gegenseitige Erbauung. In ihrem Gesang tritt die Gemeinde selbst lehrend und ermahnend auf, V. 16. 12—14. Welch ein reicher Schatz christlicher Lehre findet sich doch in unserm Gesangbuch! (Beispiele.) Und welch ernste Mahnung und süßer Trost! (Beispiele.) Was in der Predigt fehlt, wird gewöhnlich durch unsere Lieder ersetzt.

d. Persönlicher Verkehr mit Gott. Während die Gemeinde singt, verkehrt jedes gläubige Herz mit seinem himmlischen Vater. Gott redet auch in unsern Liedern zu uns, V. 16a, und wir reden zu ihm, 16c. So zieht der wahre Friede Gottes in unsere Herzen ein, V. 15a.

Anwendung. Welch ein köstliches Ding ist doch unser Gemeindegesang! Wieviel kann durch ihn ausgerichtet werden!

2.

a. „In aller Weisheit“ muß der Gemeindegesang gepflegt und das einzelne Lied gewählt, vorbereitet und gesungen werden, V. 16b. (Wir verbinden „in aller Weisheit“ mit „lehret und vermahnet“.) Der Gemeindegesang darf nie Nebensache werden. Die Lieder müssen von rechter Art sein, inhaltsreich, wie die in unserm Gesangbuch. Sie müssen den Bedürfnissen der Gemeinde gemäß und im Einklang mit der Predigt gewählt werden. Die Orgelbegleitung darf nicht stören. Die Gemeinde muß ordentlich singen.

b. Es muß Gemeindegesang sein. Mit den Worten „auch selbst“, V. 16b, redet Paulus alle Gemeindeglieder an. Alle sollen am Singen teilnehmen. Wem die Stimme fehlt, der kann doch in Gedanken folgen. Wie anstößig ist es, wenn Leute während des Gesanges herumgaffen oder gar plaudern!

c. Es muß ein Singen sein, das von Herzen kommt, V. 16c, also nicht ein gedankenloses Singen, Matth. 15, 8. Wie oft fehlen doch sonst gewissenhafte Christen gerade in dieser Hinsicht!

d. Unser Singen muß „in dem Namen des Herrn Jesu“ geschehen, V. 17. Nicht nur mit Nennung seines Namens, sondern im wahren Glauben an ihn und mit dem Bewußtsein, daß unsere schönsten Lieder ohne Jesum Gott ein Greuel wären.

Schl u ß. So wollen wir uns denn immer den herrlichen Zweck unsers Gemeindegesanges vor die Seele halten und alles tun, was in unsern Kräften steht, damit derselbe unter uns erreicht werde. Lied 349, 15. E. J. J.

Quinquagesimä.

1 Kor. 13.

Gott hatte die Gemeinde zu Korinth mit vielen herrlichen geistlichen Gaben geziert. Diese sollten im Dienst des Nächsten und der Gemeinde gebraucht werden. Nun begehrten aber die meisten nicht die Gaben und Ämter, durch die sie die größten Dienste würden leisten können, sondern solche, die es ihnen möglich machen würden, vor den Leuten zu glänzen. Deshalb zeigte ihnen Paulus, daß sie als Christen nach den Gaben und Ämtern streben sollten, die am meisten zur Erbauung der Gemeinde dienen würden, Kap. 12, besonders aber nach der wahren Liebe, Kap. 13.

Wir sind zu denselben Fehlern geneigt wie die Korinther. Deshalb heute die Frage:

Was soll uns bewegen, vor allen Dingen nach der wahren Liebe zu streben?

1. Die Notwendigkeit der Liebe;
2. die Herrlichkeit der Liebe;
3. die Unvergänglichkeit der Liebe.

1.

a. Fehlt uns die wahre Liebe, dann ist unser ganzes Christenleben und =wirken eitel Heuchelei, B. 1—3.

1. Trotz der herrlichsten Gaben sind wir doch ohne Liebe vor Gott nichts, B. 1. 2. Menschen mögen uns bewundern; Gott gefallen wir nicht.

2. Selbst die großartigsten Werke, z. B. Liebestätigkeit, Aufopferung von Hab und Gut, Leib und Leben zum besten unserer Mitmenschen, können uns vor Gott nichts nützen, wenn die rechte Liebe fehlt, B. 3. Sie kommen eben nicht von Herzen.

b. Warum die Liebe so notwendig ist: Jak. 2, 17. 26.

Anwendung. Prüfen wir uns! Wie und in welchem Geiste verwenden wir unsere Gaben? Warum tun wir gute Werke? (Man gehe hier ins Einzelne.)

2.

a. Die Liebe ist herrlich, weil sie eine so vielseitige Tugend, ja die Quelle aller andern Tugenden ist, B. 4—7. (Ausführliche Auslegung dieser Beschreibung der Liebe.)

b. Die Liebe ist herrlich, weil unsere Mitmenschen durch ihre Erweisungen erfreut und glücklich gemacht werden. (Ausführung auf Grund von B. 4—7.)

c. Weil wir selber durch das Wachstum in der Liebe Gott immer ähnlicher werden, 1 Joh. 4, 8. (Vgl. Beschreibung der Liebe, B. 4—7.)

Anwendung. Vergleichen wir unser Leben mit B. 4—7. Wie oft haben wir lieblos gehandelt! Buße tun und nach der Liebe streben, besonders im täglichen Verkehr mit unsern Mitmenschen. Unser Vorbild ist Christus.

3.

a. Alle andern geistlichen Gaben in der Kirche sind vergänglich. Sie sind eben nur für dieses Leben bestimmt. (Ausführen!) So gehören sie zu dem Stückwerk, das aufhören muß, sobald wir vollkommen geworden sind, B. 8—13. Beispiel: Knabe, der Mann geworden ist.

b. Die Liebe hingegen hört nimmer auf; sie bleibt in Ewigkeit, B. 8. 13. „Auch Glaube und Hoffnung bleiben ewiglich, sofern das, was wir glauben und hoffen, ewig dauert. Aber Art und Natur des Glaubens und Hoffens wird aufhören. . . Die Liebe hingegen wird nicht nur hinsichtlich ihres Gegenstandes, sondern auch nach ihrer Art und Natur, wird als Liebe nimmer aufhören.“ (Stöckhardt.) Sie ist also ein ewiges Besitztum der Kinder Gottes.

Schluf. Ermahnung zum Streben nach der Liebe, mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf das tägliche Leben. E. J. F.

Septuagesimä.

1 Kor. 9, 24—10, 5.

Luk. 13, 23. 24. Der Herr leugnet nicht die ernste Wahrheit, daß in der Tat nur wenige selig werden. Aber, will er sagen, darum sorgt euch nur nicht; seht vielmehr zu, daß ihr selber selig werdet. Das ist nicht so leicht, Matth. 13, 19—22; darum „ringet danach“ usw. Wie oft wiederholen die Apostel diese Mahnung! Jud. 3; 1 Tim. 6, 12; Hebr. 12, 1; 2 Tim. 2, 5. So auch diese Epistel. Jenes Wort Jesu ist ein treffliches Thema für unsere heutige Betrachtung.

„Ringet danach, daß ihr durch die enge Pforte eingehet!“

Dazu soll uns bewegen

1. der überaus herrliche Kampfprijs;
2. die große Gefahr, daß wir den Prijs verlieren;
3. das Beispiel derer, die den Prijs verloren haben.

1.

Die Isthmischen Spiele (ähnlich den Olympischen Spielen, die in neuerer Zeit wieder ins Leben gerufen worden sind). Der Prijs: ein Pinienkranz, der bald verwelkte, Ehre, die bald vergessen war.*)

Jedes Menschen Leben ist ein Kampf, ein Wettlauf. Was ist der Prijs, nach dem die meisten streben? Täglich Brot, Reichtum, Ruhm und Ehre. Und am Ende der Laufbahn sinkt der Mensch ins Grab und all sein erkämpftes Gut mit ihm.

Uns ist ein unvergleichlich größerer Prijs ausgesetzt: ein Kleinod, Phil. 3, 14; eine unvergängliche Krone, Offenb. 2, 10; 2 Tim. 4, 8; 1 Petr. 1, 3—5; Hebr. 9, 15. Wieviel ernstlicher sollten wir danach ringen! Phil. 3, 8; Röm. 8, 18.

B. 24. Nur einer; doch liefen sie alle mit gleichem Eifer. Wieviel mehr wir, die wir alle das Kleinod erlangen können, wenn wir nur recht ringen! Offenb. 2, 10; Hebr. 4, 1.

2.

Aber recht ringen. Der Wettläufer mußte nicht nur schnell laufen, sondern gerade und in der rechten Richtung, stracks auf das Ziel zu. Der Kämpfer durfte nicht planlos um sich schlagen; er mußte seinen Gegner fest ins Auge fassen und geschickt sein, dessen Streichen auszuweichen und ihm feste Hiebe zu versetzen. Das erforderte schon lange vor der Zeit der Kampfspiele tüchtige Vorbereitung, und dann galt es aushalten bis

*) Der Prijs in den Olympischen Spielen: ein Kranz vom heiligen Ölbaum; in den Pythischen Spielen: Palmzweige und Lorbeerkränze; in den Isthmischen Spielen: Pinienzweige und Lorbeerkränze; in den Nemeischen Spielen: Palmzweige und Eppichkränze.

ans Ende der Laufbahn, bis alle Gegner besiegt waren. Wer nicht alle diese Punkte wohl beachtete, verlor den Kampfpreis.

Wer nicht mit Ernst und Eifer und Ausdauer ringt, trägt auch die Krone des ewigen Lebens nicht davon. Es erfordert Vorbereitung, daß man nicht aufs Ungewisse laufe, nicht in die Luft streiche. Man muß den Feind kennen und lernen, wie man ihm am besten beikommen kann. Gottes Wort lehrt uns beides. Der Feind: Teufel, Welt und Fleisch; Irrlehre, Fleischeslust, Weltliebe; besondere Lieblingsünden usw. Die rechte Kampfweise: Eph. 6, 10—18. Dabei nie das Ziel aus dem Auge verlieren; bei allem Arbeiten und Wirken, in Freud und Leid nicht vergessen: Wir sind zwar in dieser Welt, aber unser Ziel ist jene Welt. Und unsere Laufbahn ist genau so lang wie unser Leben; nicht nur wer schief läuft, verliert die Krone; aufhören, ehe das Ziel erreicht ist, tut's auch. Unsere Feinde kämpfen bis zum letzten Atemzug; ja der letzte Feind ist der Tod. Wie groß die Gefahr, daß wir den Preis verlieren! Darum „ringet danach“ usw.

3.

Ja, wie viele, die den Preis verloren haben! Beispiel: Kap. 10, 1—5. 600,000 Mann, und nur zwei kamen ans Ziel. Es war ihre eigene Schuld. Gott hatte alles mögliche für sie getan, 10, 1—4; aber sie hatten alles durch Undank, Ungehorsam und Unglauben verschärzt, Hebr. 3, 7—11. Ebenso das spätere Israel, Matth. 23, 37; Jes. 5, 1—4; Mark. 12, 1 ff. Andere Beispiele: Judas, Demas, die Galater.

Das ist uns zur Mahnung, aber auch zum Trost geschrieben. Menschliche Kraft, Weisheit, Geschicklichkeit hilft nichts in diesem Kampf, 1 Kor. 2, 14; 2 Kor. 3, 5; aber damit wir nicht im Hinblick auf unsere großen und mächtigen Feinde verzagen und ausrufen: „Je, wer kann denn selig werden!“ Phil. 2, 13; 1 Petr. 5, 10. Dazu hat Gott uns dieselbe Gnade erwiesen wie einst Israel, Röm. 1, 16; Gal. 3, 26. 27; Röm. 6, 3—5; 1 Kor. 10, 16. 17; 11, 26. Durch seine Kraft können wir das Ziel erreichen. Joh. 10, 27. 28; Ps. 23. Lassen wir uns nun aber auch durch das Exempel Israels warnen: „Niedergeschlagen in der Wüste“, aus Gottes Gnadengegenwart ewiglich verbannt.

Er schenke uns seine Gnade, daß wir erkennen die Zeit, darinnen wir heimgesucht sind, die Gnadenhand Gottes ergreifen und festhalten und dann in seiner Kraft den guten Kampf des Glaubens kämpfen bis ans Ende. Paulus, 2 Tim. 4, 7. 8. Lied 282, 4. T. G.

Seragesimä.

2 Kor. 11, 19—12, 9.

„Vierfach ist das Ackerfeld; Mensch, wie ist dein Herz bestellt?“ Das Gleichnis im Sonntagsevangelium erzählt der Herr zu unserer Prüfung. Demselben Zweck soll auch diese lange Epistel dienen. Der Apostel rühmt sich selber; was ihn dazu veranlaßt hat, Kap. 10 und

11, 1—18. Er tut es nicht gern, R. 21, 23; aber um der Ehre Christi willen, der ihm sein Amt übertragen hat, und zum Wohl der Christen, an die er schreibt, nämlich damit sie nicht irregeführt werden, muß er sich rühmen. Zu demselben Zweck darf jeder Christ sich rühmen. Er muß darum aber auch etwas zu rühmen haben. Darin dient Paulus uns zum Vorbild.

Paulus unser Vorbild

1. in unserm Leben; 2. in unserm Wirken;
3. in unserm Leiden.

1.

Wenn der Apostel, R. 19, 20, den Korinthern vortwirft, daß sie sich allerlei von seiten der falschen Apostel gefallen lassen, so will er gewiß, daß sie sein Verhalten unter ihnen mit dem der falschen Apostel vergleichen sollen; so hatte er nicht gehandelt. Vielmehr: R. 23 a.

Vor Menschen (nicht vor Gott) sollen wir uns rühmen können: Es kann mir niemand etwas vorwerfen. Unser ganzes Leben soll eine Zierde und ein Beweis unsers Glaubens sein. Es hat ja dies alles keinen verdienstlichen Wert, aber es ist eine nötige Frucht des Glaubens. Und die Welt beurteilt unsere Lehre und unser Bekenntnis nach unserm Leben; stimmt beides nicht miteinander, so hält sie unser Christentum für eitel Heuchelei, und gar oft mit Recht.

Prüfen wir uns ernstlich. Gilt von uns Matth. 5, 13. 14. 16? oder Röm. 2, 23. 24?

2.

Der Apostel redet weiter von seiner Arbeit, R. 23 b—29. Welch ein erstaunliches Arbeiten! Unermüdlich, ohne Furcht oder Sorge, nicht um schändlichen Gewinn, nicht um Ruhm, nur zum Wohl seiner Mitmenschen. Wie hat er's fertig gebracht? Phil. 4, 13.

Welch ein beschämendes Vorbild! Wie faul und bequem sind wir! Lassen uns oft durch Menschenfurcht und Menschengunst, durch Sorge für die Zukunft zurückhalten. Es gibt viel Arbeit im Reich Gottes. Gott hat uns allen unser Pfund gegeben; das sollen wir gewissenhaft gebrauchen und uns dabei nicht immer danach richten, was andere tun. Wieviel fangen wir an und lassen es dann unvollendet liegen, weil wir den Mut verlieren oder weil der Berg der Arbeit uns zu hoch wird! Welch ein Vorbild für uns, beschämend und doch ermunternd, in der Wirksamkeit des Apostels!

3.

In seinem Dienst Christi hat Paulus viel Leiden müssen, R. 23 b bis 33. Er ließ sich dadurch nicht entmutigen, sondern vielmehr anspornen, Röm. 8, 18; Phil. 3, 8. Nicht als ob es ihm immer so leicht geworden wäre; der Apostel war kein Stoiker, R. 30; 12, 5. Besonders Leiden am eigenen Leibe und innerliche Anfechtungen sind auch ihm schwer geworden, 12, 7. 8. Wie hat er es ertragen? Er hat sich der Verheißung, 12, 9, und der Erfahrung der göttlichen Gnade getröstet, 12, 1—4.

Welch ein Vorbild! Unerreicht unter uns. Wieviel Kreuzeszügel, wieviel Ungebuld und Unglaube, wieviel Verzagtheit und Kleinglaube bei uns! Und wir sollten doch Gott für solches Kreuz danken, 1 Petr. 1, 6, 7; Apost. 5, 41; 1 Petr. 4, 13. Jeder unter uns hat seinen Pfahl im Fleisch. Wieviel Murren und Klagen deswegen anstatt ruhigen Ergebens in Gottes Willen und Vertrauens auf seine Verheißung. Seine Gnade ist uns gewiß; was wollen wir mehr im Leben und im Sterben? Aber unser Gott ist freundlich und gibt uns noch mehr; er gibt auch uns besondere Offenbarungen, das heißt, Beweise, daß er bei uns ist mit seiner allmächtigen Hilfe und uns nicht verläßt, Ps. 97, 11.

Erkennen wir, wieviel uns noch fehlt? Laßt uns neuen Fleiß anwenden, Frucht zu bringen in Geduld! Lied 141, 12, 13. T. S.

Miscellanea.

“Rethinking Missions.”

This is the title of a book, a copy of which lies before me at this writing, which was issued as the culmination of a series of reports released by an Appraisal Commission, headed by Dr. William Ernest Hocking and published by the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, Albert L. Scott, chairman. We say at once and with great vehemence: As the reports released to the press of our country were vicious in their denial of Christian truth, so the book is essentially blasphemous. It is necessary to refer to but one statement in the book to characterize its vicious and revolutionary position, namely, that in which the original objective of Christian missions, that of preaching one way of salvation, and one only, one name, one atonement, — “this plan with its particular historical center in the career of Jesus must become the point of regard for every human soul,” — is discarded.

It is not surprising that a book of this kind, subverting the foundations not only of Christian missions, but of Christianity itself, should appear at this time. It is the natural result of the unionistic and syncretistic attitude assumed by most so-called Christian denominations in our day. It began with the suffering of false doctrines within the denominations themselves and the recognition of Christian brotherhood without the unity of faith and confession. At the same time it proceeded from the so-called non-fundamental to the essential and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, exercising a false toleration, which struck at the very root of man's relation to his God. If one yields on the question of the Virgin Birth and of the inspiration of the Bible, he is bound soon to yield on the question of salvation through the blood of Christ and justification by faith in Christ. This is precisely what the book *Rethinking Missions* demonstrates. Its entire presentation shows an abysmal ignorance of the fundamental truths of Christianity. It proposes, first of all, to dissolve all so-called sectarian differences in the Foreign Mission fields. “It would,” as the *Literary Digest* has it, “seek truth in all major non-Christian religions and cooperate with them against paganism [?], the common enemy,

and it would put the missionary enterprise under one administration." In other words, Christians, Buddhists, Shintoists, Confucianists, Taoists, Mohammedans, and members of whatever other faith are to find the least common denominator in their several religions, agree upon that as essential, and treat everything else as non-essential.

As stated above, it is not surprising that this stage has been reached. It is the inevitable result of relinquishing the truth of the vicarious atonement and of the justification by faith in the blood of Jesus Christ. The pagan religions have never possessed this truth, and most of the Christian denominations have abandoned it, since they have permitted Christ to be preached as a mere model, or exemplar, a paragon of good works and holy living. They have missed the essential features of His own teaching and of that of His apostles, namely, "that He redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with His holy, precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death." It is not surprising, then, that, as the *Literary Digest* reports, the *Baptist* believes the recommendation of the commission to be right and that the *Churchman*, organ of the liberal wing of the Episcopal Church, gives the report its unqualified approval. It is to be expected that all Modernists will share this view and most likely make the whole question an issue in the interest of further Liberalism.

Fortunately, Christian consciousness is not yet altogether dead. The General Council of the Presbyterian Church in the United States makes the statement: "What is proposed is virtually a denial of evangelical Christianity." The *Presbyterian Banner* writes: "The churches will not, and ought not to for one moment, consider the abandonment of the evangelical basis of missions, resting on the conception of Christ as the only and sufficient Savior and Redeemer." In the *Presbyterian* we find this denunciation of the report: "It is an effort of Modernism, for lack of a better word, to check the noble work of evangelical Christians for more than a century. It is an effort to establish something in place of the old Gospel in other lands, as it has been done to a considerable degree in our own land." Similar statements are found in the *Missionary Review of the World* and in the *American Church Monthly*. The *Watchman-Examiner* is even more emphatic in its rejection of the report. It says that the Appraisal Commission is "rationalistic in its entire viewpoint." "The report of this commission is unjustly critical of the whole Foreign Mission enterprise." "What will the churches do with this report? Will they sanction it or reject it? In any case it will tend to cut the nerve of missions. If accepted and literally followed, it would mean death not only to Foreign Missions, but also to the Church at large. A non-missionary Church soon becomes a missing Church." "The report is but a further illustration of the fact that Modernism is becoming so deeply entrenched in our present-day religious life that many of its points of view are stated as though they were universally accepted by Christian people." And finally, to quote from only one Lutheran paper, the *Kirchenblatt* (A. L. C.) says: "*Uns ist in den letzten Jahren nichts vor Augen getreten, was so krass den Unterschied zwischen neutestamentlichem Christentum und dem Modernismus ans Licht stellt wie dieser Bericht.*"

We see only one possible good feature connected with the report of the Appraisal Commission and with the book *Rethinking Missions*, namely, that referred to by the *Christian Century*, which suggests that it portends a major battle along the old lines. If the report arouses the denominations which still preach the vicarious atonement to the need of studying the inerrant truth of the Gospel once more, of reaffirming the fundamental doctrines of Christianity with new vigor, of insisting upon the exclusive character of its message, and of reconsecrating themselves to the task of preaching salvation through the blood of Christ, then it may be a fortunate thing that it was published.

P. E. K.

Where Does Our Educational System Fall Down?

It can hardly be said that we have failed in providing a systematic training for the preschool and for the elementary-school age. Our parish, or Christian day-school, system is as close to perfection in design as any school system conceivably can be. The religious training which is given in a full course of one of our schools surely has the prospects of laying a foundation of Christian knowledge which will presumably last through life. In a measure the same objective is reached through other agencies besides the regular Christian day-school, such as the Sunday-school, preferably in connection with a Saturday-school and some form of the summer-school. The instruction thus provided for, together with that of the training class in the preconfirmation year and of thorough confirmation instruction preceding admission into adult membership in the congregation, may be considered to be as nearly adequate as can be expected on the part of fallible human beings.

But what are we doing in an official way for the period following confirmation, not only the junior age, but the entire adolescent period? The information dispensed in the preadolescent age will in most cases not become functioning in church activities unless the proper training is provided. The various changes attending puberty usually set a definite boundary between the thinking of childhood and that of adult age. Young people in the age of early adolescence, of middle adolescence, and even of late adolescence must be given not only further instruction, but also practical training in the activities of the local congregation and of the Church at large. Where such training does not obtain, it is a rare occurrence for young people to gain the ability to perform the work of adult members of the congregation. Only a small percentage of our members is familiar with every department of their own congregation's work, with the objects of our Synod, with the field of missions. Very few of them can express themselves with intelligence and ease in the voters' meeting, in the meeting of the ladies' aid, or in that of any other organization. Many of those who possess a certain glibness of speech lack the basic information concerning the precepts of the Bible concerning the government of the church, the relative position of men and women, and scores of other questions.

What have we as a church body done till now in order to give our young people systematic training along these lines, so that they may take an intelligent interest in all the affairs of the congregation, in all the church-work that is carried on, in systematic and adequate giving, and in

the many other features connected with a Christian congregation functioning along the lines indicated by Holy Writ? We have acknowledged the work of the Walther League, even encouraged their endeavors by appropriate resolutions, and we have elected a board to act in an advisory capacity with reference to young people's organizations. But all these efforts are not yet reaching one half of our young people.

What we need at this time, what we should have had for decades, is a thorough system of training for *all the young people of postconfirmation age*. It is necessary for *every pastor* and for *every congregation* to take up this matter, to make a thorough study of the needs involved, and to make such provision for some form of systematic instruction and training of our young people as will meet the requirements of the Word of God. Far better for the pastor to be absent from some meeting of a board of the congregation than to miss a meeting of the young people. And we might consider very seriously whether but one meeting night in a month is adequate for the needs of our young Christians, whether we ought not to make some provision to counteract the influence of encroaching worldliness by positive activity instead of by peremptory prohibitions. The matter is worthy of our most earnest consideration. P. E. K.

„Verzage nicht, du Häuflein Klein.“

Auf verschiedene Anfragen hin sei hier mitgeteilt, daß die Forscher über den Ursprung des Liedes früher ziemlich geteilter Meinung waren, daß man aber in neueren Werken sich mit ziemlicher Sicherheit über den Verfasser ausspricht. Koch (Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs, IV, 254 ff.) hält den Schwedenkönig Gustav Adolf für den Verfasser. Er behauptet, daß der König „dieses Lied mit seinen drei Versen ursprünglich in Prosa verfaßt hat nach der Leipziger Schlacht im Jahre 1631, und auf sein Geheiß sein Feldprediger, Dr. Jaf. Fabricius, . . . es in Reime brachte, worauf es dann im schwedischen Feldlager häufig gesungen wurde“. Demgegenüber aber halten die neueren Hymnologen mit großer Einstimmigkeit fest an der Aussage des M. Jeremias Weber, Diakonus an St. Nikolai in Leipzig, der das Lied mit der Aufschrift druckte „Herzfreudiges Trostliedlein auf das von der evangelischen Armee in der Schlacht von Leipzig am 17. September 1631 geführte Kriegslosungswort ‚Gott mit uns!‘ gestellt von M. Jo. A., Pfarrherrn zu Großen-Sommern in Düringen“. Dies war kein anderer als der Pfarrer Johann Michael Altenburg, der auch sonst als geistlicher Lieberdichter bekannt ist und der im Jahre 1631 nach Erfurt fliehen mußte, wohin die Nachricht von dem Siege bei Leipzig sehr bald gelangte. Für Altenburg als Verfasser haben sich unter andern entschieden Julian (A Dictionary of Hymnology, 54), Gunton (Favorite Hymns, 194) und Dorisch (Das deutsche evangelische Kirchenlied, 135). Vgl. auch Brown and Butterworth, Story of the Hymns and Tunes, 84. P. E. K.

Automobiles in the Service of the Gospel.

The Wichern Society in Germany has five motor-cars in its service, which tour Germany regularly during the summer months. Last summer each motor-car was the center of fully one thousand open-air meetings. The smallest attendance at these meetings was 40 persons, the largest 400.

Holland News Bureau.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Aus der Synode. Unter den Jubilaren, die in den verschiedenen Distriktsblättern erwähnt werden, finden sich folgende Namen: die Pastoren C. M. Road, E. Werfelmann und A. Pfotenhauer im Nord-Illinois-Distrikt; die Pastoren M. Adams, J. P. Müller, W. Harms, E. Flach, S. Frinde, C. G. Weder, die von Nord-Nebraska aus einberichtet wurden; P. M. T. Golls, über den im Blatte des Südlichen Distrikts berichtet wird; P. J. Deckmann sen., der zusammen mit D. Theo. Wünger im Blättchen des Minnesota-Distrikts genannt wird. Diese Brüder haben fünfzig Jahre im Weinberge des Herrn gedient. Aus dem Atlantischen Distrikt kommt die Nachricht, daß Direktor Geo. A. Romoser sein vierzigjähriges Amtsjubiläum hat feiern dürfen und daß man an demselben Tage der vierzigjährigen Amtswirksamkeit Dr. S. Steins an unserer östlichen Anstalt gedachte. Die Brüder in Brasilien feierten das silberne Amtsjubiläum Präses Aug. Heines und Prof. L. C. Nehsfeldts. Es ist sehr anzuerkennen, daß diese zwei Brüder mit unserer kirchlichen Arbeit in Brasilien gleichsam aufgewachsen sind. — Alle Distriktsblätter haben besondere Artikel über unsere Notkollekte gebracht, und aus manchen Distrikten kommen erfreuliche Nachrichten über die Beteiligung an diesem Werke. Die Brüder im westlichen Canada haben sich trotz ihrer großen Armut fast ohne Ausnahme an der Kollekte beteiligt, und mit gutem Erfolg. In Süd-Nebraska ist die Schuld ganz bedeutend verringert worden. Auch aus andern Distrikten und einzelnen Städten kommt die Nachricht, daß unsere Christen das Werk des Herrn nicht vernachlässigen wollen. — Unsere Gemeindeschulen werden immer wieder erwähnt, und die Distriktsblätter aus Süd-Wisconsin, Ollahoma, Michigan und Iowa bringen öfters Artikel über das Schulwesen. Auch die Jugendarbeit wird fleißig betrieben, wie eingesandte Berichte zeigen, ebenso die Arbeit unter den lutherischen Studenten auf den verschiedenen Universitäten, z. B. in Indiana und Nebraska. — Aus California kommt die Nachricht, daß sich ein junger Japaner namens Shimida in unserer dortigen Anstalt hat einschreiben lassen, um sich als Pastor und Missionar ausbilden zu lassen. — Die Anzahl der Gemeinden, die ihr goldenes Jubiläum feiern dürfen, mehrt sich von Jahr zu Jahr; aber auch die Zahl solcher, die sechzig und achtzig Jahre bestanden haben, ist nicht mehr gering. Der Herr hat die treue Arbeit unserer Väter reichlich gesegnet. Mögen wir bereit sein, das uns anvertraute Pfand zu hüten und — zu gebrauchen!

P. C. R.

The First Biennial Convention of the American Lutheran Conference was held in Milwaukee, November 16—18, 1932. The American Lutheran Conference, organized at Minneapolis in 1930, is a federation of the following general bodies: the American Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Lutheran Free Church, and the United Ev. Danish Lutheran Church. Its officers are: President, Dr. Otto Mees; First Vice-President, Dr. T. F. Gullixson; Second Vice-President, Rev. J. P. Nielson; Third Vice-President, Dr. O. H. Sletten; Secretary, Dr. O. P. Bersell; Treasurer, Mr. Otto Leonardson. The officers represent the following synods: the American Lutheran Church, the Nor-

wegian Lutheran Church, the United Danish Church, the Lutheran Free Church, and the Augustana Synod. The convention sermon was preached by Dr. O. Mees on Phil. 3, 12—14, his theme being "The Glory of the Incomplete," a rather queer twist of the text. What the preacher really preached on was "The Glory of Striving after the Complete." "The sermon was an earnest call to action, to strive, to work, to achieve, with all the energy we have, reaching out for those things which are before us," says the report. When the American Lutheran Conference was organized two years ago, the executive committee appointed special committees on Adjudication, Home Missions, Inner Missions, Foreign Missions, Elementary Christian Education, Higher Christian Education, Student Service, Hospitals, Young People's Work, Canadian Affairs, and Comity. The report says: "Efforts have been made to survey the whole field and find out what are the facts and conditions under which the federated bodies are working and in what respects there are opportunities for cooperation." Papers were read on the following subjects: "The Fellowship Question" (Dr. T. F. Gullixson); "The Secular Idea of Progress versus the Christian Doctrine of Sanctification" (Dr. C. Bergendorf); "An Open Declaration of Aim and Purpose" (Dr. L. W. Boe). From the report in the *Lutheran Herald* we quote: "Of great interest was the survey of the Home Mission field by Dr. Martin Anderson of Chicago showing by extensive statistics the unoccupied fields in America, which is yet more than one half pagan. The great need of Inner Mission work was emphasized by Rev. S. G. Michelfelder of Toledo. One evening was given to the commemoration of Gustavus Adolphus, Dr. C. M. Weswig, professor of history at Luther Seminary, delivering a classic address." — "The convention was one of education, orientation, and inspiration. The conference has no plan to bring about organic union or in any manner to interfere with the affairs of the different synods. Already a united effort has come about to support the only school west of the Rockies, Pacific Lutheran College. The main work to begin with will possibly be on the Home Mission field, not so much to readjust existing conditions as to agree on new fields to avoid duplications." — "At the close of the meeting Dr. Knubel of the U. L. C. was invited to address the conference, and the same resolution invited the Synodical Conference and other Lutherans to send 'friendly representations.'" — "Rev. C. V. Sheatsley, reporting for the Foreign Mission Commission, submitted the following resolution, which was adopted: 'Taking cognizance of the findings of the appraisal commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, the American Lutheran Conference would encourage evangelical Christendom everywhere by affirming that the Lutheran Church, in obedience to its Lord, unalterably continues to preach to all the world the Gospel of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ alone.'" J. T. M.

Is a Change Concerning College Athletics Imminent? — On account of the question of sports at our own colleges and seminaries this topic is not entirely tabu for our theological paper. One of our exchanges reports that Yale University, according to an announcement of its president, James R. Angell, is contemplating a change in the handling of athletics at this institution. Of the various residential colleges each will choose and organize its sports, and "intercollegiate contests will be emphasized and varsity football schedules reduced to only five games with tradi-

tional rivals." "Equipment and money are to be used more for large groups and less for the development of a small number." Our authority cites a prominent newspaper to the effect that "the general tendency in society to-day is to get away from 'stars' and to turn the spotlight upon individual welfare." A report submitted on the gate receipts at the stadium in Yale is amazing, to put it mildly. In 1912—13 the total receipts from all sports were \$132,705, with expenses of \$116,316. In 1930—31 gate receipts from football alone were \$1,140,568, netting \$600,000. A weekly is quoted as saying: "This astonishing increase without doubt helped largely to produce the demand to spend in proportion to income, games ballyhooed by the daily press, and the temptation to put on at high ticket prices the best shows purchasable from high-paid professional coaching of a few picked athletes." Many educational authorities are agreed that here we are touching a very sore spot in the present-day life of our large American colleges, which loudly calls for remedial action. A.

Buchmanism Asserting Itself.—The newspapers of our country, especially those appearing in Detroit, have been giving a good deal of attention to the new Oxford movement, which is called after its chief promoter, Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman. A writer in the *Christian Century*, referring to a special article in the *Detroit Free Press*, says: "Here are the various opinions of the Oxford group gathered by the *Free Press* writer and published in the issue referred to above: 'Country-club religion.' 'Salvation Army technique, two-dollared up with a silk hat and dress shirt.' 'A powerful spiritual influence in our generation. Perhaps the most powerful.' 'An adaptation to modern uses of old, valid, spiritual technique, employing the candid vocabulary of our time. A blend of Quaker quiet and evangelical fervor.' 'A form of evangelism which combines the advantages of mysticism, mesmerism, spiritualism, eroticism, psychoanalysis, and high-powered salesmanship.' 'A mixture of primitive Wesleyanism and Freudian sex psychology. It is hard to tell where Wesley's phraseology ends and Freud's jargon begins.' 'A revolt against arid negative intellectualism — a return to the primitive faith.' 'Georgia camp-meeting stuff — intellectual tone with a tinge of sense.'" The Detroit meetings of Dr. Buchman, who was accompanied by Rev. Samuel M. Shoemaker and thirty-five associates, were held first in the Dearborn Inn and after that in the Book-Cadillac Hotel. Years ago we were amused by the spectacle of millionaire Socialists, who, adorned with silk hats and dressed in the finest of clothes, were holding forth on the advantages of a social order in which millionaires would be impossible. It seems in Buchmanism we are witnessing a parallel phenomenon in the field of religion. We are awaiting further information on this movement. A.

A Remarkable Analysis of the Impotence of Unionism.—Once in a while, like a lonely voice on an isolated mountaintop, a member of one of the historic Reformed churches courageously points out the fallacies on which unionism is built. The *Lutheran Companion* of August 13, 1932, has taken over the following report of a Presbyterian sermon printed in the *Minneapolis Journal* of June 18, and we reproduce it here without any comment of our own:—

"Organic church union is a delusion, Rev. H. Warren Allen told his congregation in a sermon recently at the First Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Allen told of his experiences in Canada, where union of the churches has been accomplished, and said: —

“Six years as a first-hand witness proved to me by its practise that my theory was correct. The United Church of Canada, from the point of promoting church union, is a colossal failure. It is simply a glorified Methodist Church.

“Seven years have passed, and Canada has not yet recovered from the tragic conflict that ensued. Homes were broken, lifelong friendships were severed, people were left without pastors, churches were burned and padlocked, lawsuits were instituted by the score, one case even going to the Privy Council of England.

“To-day, instead of union, theirs is disunion, a torn and bleeding body of Christ, wounded in the house of friends, who tried by ecclesiastical and civil law to force organic union upon an unwilling people. There are more church-buildings in Canada than at any time in history. It will take the United Church of Canada fifty years to live down the stain upon her record in the methods she used in coming into existence. Union cannot be forced. It must grow of the spirit. You cannot create an organization which takes for its platform peace, love, brotherhood, and unity and uses war, hate, enmity, and division as its methods of promotion and expect it to succeed.

“If the Roman Catholic Church, with a Pope as sovereign, with uniformity of worship, and religion as the dominant force in the life of men, was not able to succeed in compelling unity and uniformity, there is little chance to-day of our returning to the medieval ideal when education and democracy tend to produce a variety of thinking instead of uniformity of thought. Church union is an exploded theory. It is the habit of mind of the Middle Ages, and the verdict of history is against it.

“In the second place, human nature is against it. Church-union fad-dists need a course in psychology. The theory of Karl Marx's absolute state, socialism in economics, and organic unity in ecclesiasticism, all are of the same breed. One might as well argue that there should be one political party, one standard of living, as to say that all should worship under one organization. Distinction represented by such terms as Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, are not simply the results of human ‘cussedness,’ but they correspond, in part at least, to deep underlying differences in human nature, differences of which organized religion is bound to take cognizance.

“Finally, the theory of organic unity is a delusion because the Bible does not teach it. It does teach a spiritual unity, which is a far different thing. Paul says there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit; differences of administration, but the same Lord; diversities of operation, but the same God.

“Not organic union, but federation is the only feasible and practical method of church cooperation. And even this method will have to be much improved upon in its actual working, as represented by the Federal Council of Churches in America, whose action and declarations have been so radically opposed to the beliefs and convictions of the great majority of its constituency which it claims to represent.

"The greatest obstacle to church union to-day is the apostasy of the Church. There can be no real union at the expense of truth. When denominations are divided over the great cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, how can we expect denominations to unite with each other? The only union possible would be a union of all fundamentalists of the various denominations and a union of all Modernists of the various denominations. And human nature prevents this." A.

Paper Communion Cups. — Perhaps our readers can understand the irony in the following much better than those of the *Watchman-Examiner*, from which we quote; the lesson nevertheless is important for all of us. We read: "When the individual Communion glasses appeared, we were not opposed to the innovation, for it seemed to us that they were more cleanly and more healthful than the common cup. On the other hand, as we looked back over history, we felt just a little ashamed that our age was so fastidious and overparticular. Now, however, the limit has been reached; for we are now informed that even the individual glass is considered dangerous by some people and that paper containers, which are to be used but once, have been substituted in places. This to us is ridiculous, and we sincerely hope that it will not become common. We are not certain, however, that the innovation will not become popular; for are not drinks served in paper containers at our soda-water fountains? We have heard of some churches that have even proposed to permit smoking on the back seats! There is nothing like being up to date!" J. T. M.

Death of Dr. Patton. — Dr. Francis L. Patton, president of Princeton University from 1888 to 1902, preceding Woodrow Wilson there, and during the next eleven years president of Princeton Theological Seminary, died in Hamilton, Bermuda, November 25, at the age of eighty-nine. Dr. Patton went to Bermuda in 1913, upon his retirement from active life. In 1871 he came to Chicago as professor of theology at the McCormick (now Presbyterian) Seminary. During his service there he was prominent in the David Swing heresy trial. It was he who drew up the complaint of thirty specifications against Dr. Swing, who was minister at Central Church, preceding the ministry there of Dr. Gunsaulus. The trial resulted in Dr. Swing's acquittal. Dr. Patton was the oldest moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly and was frequently honored by his Church; he was invited to preach at the golden jubilee of Presbyterianism in Edinburgh in 1927. A.

II. Ausland.

„Völlig umgearbeitete Auflagen.“ Der Verlag Dörffling & Franke teilt in der „A. E. Z.“ mit, daß „D. Chr. Ernst Luthardt's Kompendium der Dogmatik“ in dreizehnter, völlig umgearbeiteter Auflage, herausgegeben von Prof. D. Dr. Robert Zelle in Heidelberg, Anfang Dezember 1932 erscheint. Wir schreiben dies nicht, um hier das Buch zur Anzeige zu bringen, sondern um auf eine Erscheinung aufmerksam zu machen, die einem in der theologischen Bücherwelt des öftern begegnet. Was wir meinen, kann der Leser selber den Worten der Anzeige, die wir hier folgen lassen, entnehmen. Wir lesen: „Viel schwieriger war die Aufgabe, das Buch so zu gestalten, daß es in der Methode den modernen wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen genügt. In dieser Hinsicht mußte aus dem Buche, das in Anwendung der alten

Methode, die die einzelnen loci einfach nebeneinanderstellt und dem Studierenden fertige Resultate vorsetzt, ein Buch werden, das ein Ganzes nicht bloß darstellt, sondern sich organisch entwickeln läßt. Dazu mußten nicht bloß einzelne Paragraphen, sondern auch ganze Partien umgestellt, mehrere Paragraphen völlig neu geschrieben, und vor allem mußte ein fortlaufender, alles einzelne verbindender Text gegeben werden. Dabei galt es natürlich, von der Arbeit Luthardts möglichst viel zu erhalten; das heißt, nur das durfte fallengelassen werden, was mit dem modernen wissenschaftlichen Empfinden unmöglich in Einklang zu bringen war.“ Wie D. Zelle dies alles fertiggebracht hat, wissen wir nicht, denn wir haben die neue Ausgabe noch nicht gesehen. Wir gebrauchen noch immer (und werden auch in Zukunft wohl noch gebrauchen) die erste Auflage, die nach des Verfassers Tode bearbeitet worden ist von Lic. F. J. Winter. Die „alte Methode“ (die wir da noch vorfinden), die „die einzelnen loci einfach nebeneinanderstellt und dem Studierenden fertige Resultate vorsetzt“, gefällt uns ganz ausgezeichnet; den Gang nach einer neuen Methode in der Dogmatik, die „ein Ganzes nicht bloß darstellt, sondern sich organisch entwickeln läßt“, haben wir nie in uns verspürt. Luthardt hat ja sein „Kompendium“ vor allem für „junge Theologen“ geschrieben, die sich ein „positives Wissen“ aneignen wollen; für diesen Zweck eignet sich sein Lehrbuch sehr gut. Wir haben sehr, sehr viel Dogmatik aus Luthardts Dogmatik gelernt und andere „junge Theologen“ wohl auch. Wir konnten allerdings Luthardt nicht in allen seinen Ausführungen zustimmen. Wenn er z. B. schreibt: „Die Schrift bezeichnet die Befehrung teils als ein Werk der Gnade, teils als eine Leistung des Menschen“ (S. 283) oder: „Im Neuen Testament ist eine, natürlich durch den Glauben an Christum bedingte Heilsgesamtheit Israels in Aussicht gestellt“ (S. 407) oder: „Luther verbindet mit der stärksten Betonung der Schrift als Gottes Wort zugleich eine lebendige Anschauung von ihrer menschlichen Entstehung. . . . Darin liegt die Unterscheidung des Wesentlichen und des mehr Beiläufigen“ (S. 344), so haben wir da Luthardt nach besseren Vorbildern korrigiert. Aber bei alledem blieben wir uns des hohen Wertes des Luthardtschen „Kompendiums“ immer bewußt; nicht nur für das reiche dogmengeschichtliche Material, sondern besonders auch für die kurze, klare, übersichtliche Darlegung der Dogmen waren wir ihm stets sehr dankbar, wie wir auch Jacobs, Pieper, Stump und andern gerade wegen ihrer Beibehaltung der alten Methode dankbar gewesen sind.

Nun kommt aber etwas Neues unter dem alten Namen: „Luthardts Kompendium der Dogmatik“; darin werden ganze Partien umgestellt, mehrere Paragraphen sind völlig neu geschrieben, und vor allem ist ein fortlaufender, alles einzelne verbindender Text gegeben. Möglichst viel von der Arbeit Luthardts ist allerdings erhalten worden, aber das, was mit dem modernen wissenschaftlichen Empfinden unmöglich in Einklang zu bringen war, ist fallengelassen worden. Mit einer solch „neuen, völlig umgearbeiteten Auflage“ können wir uns nicht befreunden. Wenn so gründlich mit dem alten Kompendium aufgeräumt werden mußte, warum nicht eher ein ganz neues Buch schreiben? Warum ein Kompendium von Luthardt neu auflegen, das gar kein Luthardtsches Kompendium mehr ist? Früher ist es Meyers bekanntem Kommentar so ergangen, und darüber sind wir noch heute nicht hinweggekommen. Wilson schrieb einmal vierzehn Punkte; nachher hat man damit Schindluder getrieben. Geht so etwas auch in der Theo-

logenwelt vor? Die „Wissenschaft vom Verderben der Menschenzunge“ nennt man bekanntlich „Kakologie“. Für das Verderben, daß man verdienten Theologen nach ihrem Tode so etwas antut wie hier Luthardt, haben wir keinen Namen; aber vielleicht dürfte der Ausdruck „Kakologie“ auch hier Anwendung finden.

J. T. W.

Wie stehen moderne Missionsmänner zur Heiligen Schrift? Pfarrer D. Heinrich Stallmann zitiert in der „Freikirche“ die folgenden Worte D. Julius Richters, die dieser weit und breit bekannte Missionsführer in der „Allgemeinen Missionszeitschrift“ seinen Lesern vorgelegt hat:

„Wenn Voltaire vor anderthalb Jahrhunderten prophezeite, in einem Jahrhundert werde die Bibel ein vergessenes Buch sein, so hat ihn die Geschichte in seltsamer Weise Lügen gestraft; die Bibel ist heute das weitaus verbreitetste Buch der Menschheitsliteratur; etwa 13 Millionen Exemplare der ganzen Bibel oder von Bibelteilen werden jahraus, jahrein abgesetzt. Aber gerade das stellt uns vor das schwierige Problem, auf das ich Ihre Aufmerksamkeit richten möchte: In welchem Sinne können wir heute der nichtchristlichen Welt die Bibel als das Wort Gottes präsentieren? Wir erinnern an die berühmte Ausführung im 2. Kapitel des ersten Thessalonicherbriefes, die im 13. Vers gipfelt: ‚Wir danken Gott ohne Unterlaß dafür, daß ihr das Gotteswort, das ihr von uns zu hören bekamet, aufgenommen habt nicht als Menschenwort, sondern als das, was es in Wirklichkeit ist, Gottes Wort, wie es sich auch wirksam erweist an euch, die ihr glaubt.‘ Das war eine einfache, klare, durchschlagende Einstellung, die durch keinerlei kritische Bedenken gehemmt oder gebrochen war. Die evangelische Mission war und ist in der Lage, mit persönlichem gutem Gewissen eine ähnliche Stellung einzunehmen, soweit sie noch ungebrochen der Verbalinspiration anhängt. Wenn die Bibel vom ersten Kapitel der Genesis bis zum letzten der Offenbarung St. Johannis das untrügliche und unfehlbare Wort Gottes ist, so hat sie Recht und Pflicht, dies Wort Gottes unverfälscht zu verkündigen und zu vertreten. Allein diese Position ist für den weitaus größten Teil der evangelischen Weltmission unmöglich geworden durch die unablässige, durch zwei Jahrhunderte fortgesetzte Arbeit der historisch-kritischen Theologie und der wissenschaftlichen Bibelforschung. Die Ergebnisse und Methoden dieser wissenschaftlichen Arbeit sind auch in die Ausbildungsstätten der angehenden Missionare eingedrungen.“ — Eine traurige Sachlage, wenn die Missionare nicht mehr auf das „Es steht geschrieben!“ hinweisen können. Das seligmachende Evangelium steht im unfehlbaren Gotteswort. Wirft man das eine fort, so wird man auch das andere nicht lange behalten. A.

Independence of the Anglican Church in Australia. — Our exchanges inform us that in October of last year the leaders of the Anglican Church in Australia were assembled in Sydney and that one of the main topics of discussion was the establishment of independence for those churches which hitherto have been a part of the Church of England. We are told that the idea of independence was not born from any friction existing between the mother church in Great Britain and its daughter in Australia, but that it is prompted entirely by the geographical situation. At the meeting in Sydney a resolution of independence was adopted, and then a constitution was drafted for the new body, which now awaits ratification by the various synods of the Australian Anglican Church. A.

The Situation in Turkey is Changing. — Some startling news has come from Turkey during the last years. Is it true? Prof. Walter S. Davison of Auburn Theological Seminary, who formerly was professor of Biblical Literature in Robert College, Turkey, contributes an important article to the *Christian Century* of November 16, 1932, in which he, drawing on his acquaintance with conditions in Turkey, gives an interesting survey of changes that have been going on in that country of late and of their meaning. We are presenting a brief summary of his remarks.

Turkey, unlike Russia, so he points out, has no quarrel with religion in its proper place. There are signs, however, that the Turks are no longer satisfied with the Mohammedan religion. A few years ago a writer in one of the political papers of Constantinople boldly voiced the opinion that Islam is foreign to the native genius of the Turkish people and was foisted on them after they had conquered the Arabs in Asia Minor. Before this time the Turks had their own simple and sufficient religion. In a *Life of Mohammed* the writer admits that the founder of Islam took over many things from Christianity and maintains that the two religions are not inimical to each other. The successors of Mohammed were responsible for the enmity against Christianity manifested by the Moslems. The *ghazi* is not a devout Moslem. He is eager to encourage the spirit of religious liberty. Islam he looks upon as a hindrance to progress.

A brief statement of recent changes is as follows: —

"1) The deposition of the Sultan, the Caliph of the Islamic world, and the abolition of the caliphate itself. 2) The exile of the Sheik Ul Islam, the supreme judge of Islamic law, and the discontinuance of his office. 3) The abrogation outright of the Islamic religious law, the only law of the theocratic state, and the adoption of European codes — the Swiss civil code, the Italian penal code, and the German commercial code. 4) The closing, throughout the whole country, of the mosque schools for children (where the hodjas had taught little except the memorizing of long sections of the Koran in Arabic) and the launching of a wholly new educational program along modern lines. 5) The suppression of the ancient dervish orders, those strongholds of Moslem conservatism, and the closing of their numerous monasteries. 6) The closing of all medressehs, the theological schools, in which the clergy were trained for the mosques. 7) Finally the deleting from the constitution of the clause declaring Islam the established religion of the state."

On the other hand, one must not draw the conclusion that Turkey will soon adopt Christianity. Liberty of worship does not here mean liberty of religious propaganda. Christian proselytizing is bitterly resented by the population. "Nevertheless there are individuals here and there among the more earnest and spiritual minded Turks to whom Christianity has made its appeal and who are interested in it as a way of personal religious living. They are comparatively few, without doubt, but they may be the real hope of Turkey's religious future." Let us hope that, when the Christian flag will be unfurled in full freedom in Turkey, it will not be the symbol of Modernism, but of the old Gospel which St. Paul proclaimed. A.



 Book Review. — Literatur.

Die Apostelgeschichte, übersetzt und erklärt von Hermann Wolfgang Beyer. Vandenhoe & Ruprecht, Göttingen. 1932. 156 Seiten 6×9½. Preis: M. 5.60; bei Subscription: M. 4.70.

Es ist dies ein weiterer Band (fünftes Teilbändchen) des Wertes, das den Titel trägt „Das Neue Testament Deutsch“ und dessen Erscheinen kürzlich in dieser Zeitschrift zur Anzeige gebracht wurde. Die Anlage dieses kurzgefaßten Kommentars ist dieselbe wie die in dem schon besprochenen Band über die Epistel St. Pauli an die Römer. Nachdem ein Abschnitt in glatter Übersetzung vorgelegt ist, folgt in kleinem Druck eine Besprechung der wichtigen oder schwierigen Punkte. Es ist anzuerkennen, daß bei großer Kürze, die strengstens alles rein Fachmännische vermeidet, der Kommentar doch reichhaltig ist. Was den theologischen Standpunkt anbetrifft, so ist allerdings im Vergleich mit den Aufstellungen eines Loisy und Bouisset der Verfasser konservativ; doch macht er andererseits der ungläubigen Kritik die bedenklichsten Konzeptionen.

W. Arndt.

God and the Cosmos. A Critical Analysis of Atheism. By Prof. Theodore Graebner, D.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 352 pages, 6×9½. Price, \$3.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

There are books which really require no reviews since their very titles, appearing above names of authors fully known to, and heartily trusted and esteemed by, scores of readers, are favorable reviews in themselves. Dr. Graebner's *God and the Cosmos* belongs to this class of preferred books. The title suggests the subject which the book treats, and the name of the author is a sufficient guarantee that the subject has been treated well. In 1920 appeared Dr. Graebner's monograph on *Evolution*; this was followed in 1925 by his *Essays on Evolution*; both did much to place our esteemed colleague into the front ranks of our country's ablest Christian apologists. His *God and the Cosmos* is the natural sequel to these two controversial volumes. But it is more—it is his *magnum opus* on the subject of evolution, a profound and truly grand treatise, written in support of the belief in God, the existence of the soul, and creation as distinguished from evolution. Such a work on behalf of faith against infidelity might of course be expected from a scholar who is a theologian; but in *God and the Cosmos* it is not the theologian who meets atheism and its allies, materialism and evolutionism, but the philosopher and scientist, who in the name of reason and established scientific truth rebutes atheism, materialism, and evolutionism. At once as the reader begins to peruse the book, he becomes aware that the writer has a perfect grasp of his subject, that he is well acquainted with the whole literature which pertains to it, that he fully understands all arguments *pro et contra*, and that he is absolutely sure of his goal. The arrangement of the material, complex and difficult though it is, is clear, the language is simple, but forceful, the presentation of evidence is natural and logical, and the rebuttal is decisive. The volume is so full of valuable information that it may be used as a source-book for lectures, sermons, tracts, and popular

confutations of evolutionism. In it there is much learning, great earnestness, and downright good common sense. It contains so much scientific matter that even the most learned scholar will find it useful; nevertheless, even the most difficult matters are stated so lucidly that also the layman can follow the author and understand what a hopeless mess evolutionism is. The book should be placed in every Sunday-school library to give our high-school and college students a chance to find out what a lie atheism is. It should be in our schools to supply the teacher the needed evidence when he confutes the falsehoods of "science falsely so called." Congregations that are wondering what book their pastor would like to read will find in this volume a worthy and valuable gift. The book has a message for our age; it has a warning for our own people. It should be placed and read and discussed wherever Satan's messengers are doing unspeakable harm by their ungodly agnosticism and pernicious atheism. Books like *God and the Cosmos* are not written for the mere pleasure of writing; they are God's gifts to us, manifestations of His Spirit, to profit withal. Let not the reader fear that he cannot understand it; its sentences and paragraphs are intelligible to every person of ordinary intelligence and with a fair education. Nor let him fear that the subject will not interest him; the subject in itself is of immense interest to every thinking Christian; and besides, Professor Graebner never writes folk to sleep. We earnestly hope that within a short time this timely book will be in every school library, in every Sunday-school library, and in every public library, and besides in many Christian homes, both within and without the Lutheran Church. With respect to the arrangement of the topics, the following will show just what he who intends to buy the book may expect. Chapter I treats of the "Atheism of the Streets," the pitiful ungodliness of the common people, a lurid, but true picture of present-day conditions. Chapter II presents the "Atheism of the Schools," an important chapter for parents who are sending their boys and girls to secular colleges and universities. Chapter III treats of the "Everlasting No," the dead indifference and deep pessimism which results from atheism, together with fatalism and despair in every form. Chapter IV sets forth the "Rational Argument" for God's existence; intelligent man recognizes God's existence from the works of creation. Chapter V offers a still more subtle argument for the existence of an omnipotent, intelligent God, the proof from design, or the eternal fitness of things that are. In chapter VI the author treats "Fundamentals of Matter and Life," presenting some of the great mysteries of life that are possible only because there is a perfect God, who in wisdom made them. The "Voice of the Universe" is the subject of chapter VII; modern science and modern scientists (Lodge, Millikan, Sir James Jeans) find evolutionism incapable of explaining the miracles of the universe as they present themselves everywhere under the microscope and through the telescope. So chapter VIII closes the investigations with the prediction that the prodigals, those who wandered away from the Father's house, will return to acknowledge that atheism is groundless, materialism hopeless, and evolutionism untenable. In conclusion, we direct the attention of our readers to the foreword, which ought to be published some time in the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* as a distinctive testimony against the lie of modern atheism, to the valuable index,

to the helpful glossary, and above all to the excellent bibliography, which, we are sure, will be of great benefit to the reader. The mechanical make-up of the volume is all that can be desired. The print is clear, the paper good, and the binding durable. The gilt lettering on the red cloth cover gives the book a neat and distinguished appearance. Put it in your front-room library where people who come in may see it; it will be an ornament on your book-shelves and a dependable reference work whenever you happen to argue against atheism, materialism, and evolutionism.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER.

Protestantisches Märtyrerbuch. Bilder und Urkunden der evangelischen Märtyrergeschichte aus vier Jahrhunderten. Zusammenge stellt von Otto Michaelis. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage. Verlag von J. F. Steinkopf in Stuttgart. 264 Seiten. Preis: RM. 4.80.

Eine Sammlung von Berichten, urkundlich bezeugt, von dem Leiden und dem Tode solcher, die ihren Glauben mit dem Tode besiegelt haben, darunter Leute jedes Standes und Geschlechts, aus allerlei Volk: Deutsche, Schweden, Esten, Niederländer, Engländer, Schotten, Franzosen, Wallonen, Spanier, Italiener, Böhmen, Ungarn, Armenier; aus der Zeit der Reformation, der Gegenreformation und aus der Neuzeit, letztere besonders in Rußland; dann auf 29 Seiten Briefe von Märtyrern, Briefe an Märtyrer und weitere Urkunden über Märtyrer; am Schluß neun Gebichte, ein Register und eine Tabelle von Todestagen. — Die erzählten Geschichten sind von ungleichem Wert. Unter den Märtyrern sind solche, die sich den Tod mehr durch ihren sektiererischen Fanatismus zugezogen haben, als daß sie um ihres Glaubens willen gelitten hätten. Wenn man auch gewißlich die Hinrichtung Michael Servets nicht billigt, so ist dieser Leugner der heiligen Dreieinigkeit doch nicht unter die evangelischen Märtyrer zu rechnen! Nicht alle Angaben sind korrekt. Ich habe nicht alles vergleichen können; es fiel mir zuerst in die Augen die Geschichte von der unglücklichen Johanna Grey; es ist schwer verständlich, wie man sie in die Reihe der Märtyrer einreihen und dabei ihr eigenes letztes Wort anführen kann: „Ich bin unter dem Gesetz und durch das Gesetz zum Tode verurteilt. Ich bin unschuldig, denn wider meinen Willen bin ich zu dem Unrecht gezwungen worden, das ich mit dem Tode bezahle.“ Unerklärlich ist auch, wie der Verfasser zu dem Datum ihres Todes gekommen ist: 12. Februar 1556. Neun Tage nach ihrer Krönung, im Alter von siebenzehn Jahren, starb sie auf dem Schafott, sagt er; Tatsache ist, daß Johanna Grey am 10. Juli 1553, nach dem Tode Eduards VI., gekrönt wurde; neun Tage später wurde sie gefangengesetzt, aber erst im nächsten Jahre, nach einem Aufruhr, an dem ihr Vater teilnahm, wurde sie hingerichtet. Wenn der Verfasser im übrigen ebenso leicht mit der Geschichte umgesprungen ist, muß man sich etwas vorsehen, wenn man ihn zitiert.

E. H. Meyer.

The Course of Christian Missions. By William Owen Carver. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, N. Y. 320 pages, 5½×8¾. Price, \$3.00. Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

William Owen Carver is professor of Comparative Religions and Missions at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., and the author of a number of books on missions. In this new book he presents the facts of missionary progress in their relation to history. He does not profess to have written the history of Christian missions, but modestly calls his work an "outline of its main course." But it must be

said in justice to him that it is a very comprehensive outline, one of the fullest to be had in English, and will no doubt be well received in the missionary circles of our country.

To give the reader an idea of the contents of the book: The first four chapters are devoted to a discussion of the Biblical background of missions, the founding of the Church, and the progress of missions in the Apostolic Age; the next three cover the advance of Christianity in the world from Pentecost to the Reformation; two chapters are then devoted to the Reformation and the missions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and chapters XI to XXII present the era of modern missions, beginning with the work of Wm. Carey.

We cannot always agree with the conclusions drawn by the author, for instance, when he states (p. 95): "If we cannot excuse, we can at least understand the fact that Protestantism took no interest in missionary work beyond the confines of Europe for a hundred and fifty years." It seems to us that as long as the Lord of the Church keeps the door of missionary opportunity closed, the Church cannot be expected to enter. That certainly was the case during the sixteenth century. On the other hand, the author is right when he says of the next century: "It is less easy to understand, and less easy to justify, the active opposition to missions, when they came to be urged, on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities and systems."

Two noteworthy chapters in the book are XX and XXI. In the former the author traces the movement, begun in the last century, on the part of the various denominations to establish "free churches" within the realm of the European state religions. In the latter the Protestant missionary endeavors among the Jews is discussed.

Our pastors who are interested in missions or who desire a volume that will give them ample material for lectures on various mission-fields will find this work very serviceable.

W. G. POLACK.

Winning the Outsider. By *William E. Schramm*. A Brief Discussion of Missionary Motives and Methods. 96 pages, 5×6. Paper-bound. Price, 50 cts.

Beginning at Jerusalem. By *William H. Lehmann, D. D.* 44 pages, 5×6. Paper-bound. Price, 25 cts. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.

The first one of these brochures is a discussion of the fundamental questions that have to do with mission-work. It is of a practical nature, containing at the end of each chapter questions on what has been presented and suggested Bible-readings. The second brochure is intended to arouse interest in Home Missions and for that reason submits information on this branch of church-work as carried on by the American Lutheran Church. The appeal is evangelical. Each chapter is at the end supplied with review questions.

W. ARNDT.

Religions of Old Korea. By *Charles Allen Clark*. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 295 pages, 5½×8¼. Price, \$2.50.

The author served more than twenty years in the Korean mission and is now professor in the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea. The book consists of lectures delivered in various American seminaries and to a large

extent made up of material drawn from the author's own note-books. At the same time he has consulted a large number of works on the religions of Eastern Asia. He traces the history of the various religions which now have adherents among the Koreans — Buddhism, Confucianism, particularly the Shamanism, or spirit-worship, practised by the great masses of this country (and Korea has a population of twenty million). Even in this most degraded cult there is the recognition of "a supreme God over all," in confirmation of Rom. 1, 19 (p. 195), while worship is rendered to the spirits, most of whom are "definitely malignant" and for which the author finds a parallel in the Chinese *kwei* (evil spirits) and *shen* (good spirits) (pp. 113. 175). While the author seems to find some good in Buddhism and Confucianism, he makes no such claim for the Shamanism which holds the masses in its thrall. An interesting chapter on early Christian contacts (some of them doubtful) and particularly of Roman Catholic missions in Korea are treated in the final lecture. The book is supplied with footnotes throughout. The index is unsatisfactory.

TH. GRAEBNER.

Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die evangelischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands 1932.

Ein Hilfsbuch zur Kirchenkunde der Gegenwart. In der Nachfolge von D. Johannes Schneider herausgegeben von Lic. Hermann Sasse. 59. Jahrgang. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. XV und 611 Seiten 6×9. Preis, kartoniert: M. 15; in Leinwand gebunden, mit Rücken- und Deckeltitel: M. 17.50.

Dies ist wieder das schon oft angezeigte Schneidersche „Kirchliche Jahrbuch“, das bequemste und mir fast unentbehrliche Handbuch zur Kenntnis der deutsch-ländischen kirchlichen Verhältnisse. Der Name D. Schneiders, des Begründers und langjährigen Herausgebers, wird für immer mit dem „Jahrbuch“ verbunden bleiben, wie er auch immer auf dem Titelblatt erscheinen soll. Die Hauptarbeit hat Lic. Sasse getan, der aber zwölf Mitarbeiter gewonnen hat, lauter bekannte Kirchenmänner Deutschlands: Missionsdirektoren, Professoren, Generalsuperintendenten und andere. Zuerst folgt auf 176 Seiten eine eingehende Abhandlung über die kirchliche Zeitlage, die besonders die drei großen Themen von heute herausgreift: Krisis der Religion, Politik, Katholizismus. Sodann wird die fast hundert Seiten füllende kirchliche Statistik dargeboten und dann des weiteren Bericht erstattet über Jugendarbeit, Innere Mission, soziale Arbeit der Kirche, Evangelisation, Heidenmission, Judenmission, über die deutsche evangelische Kirche im Ausland, die ökumenische Bewegung und den Personalstand der Kirchenbehörden, Freikirchen, theologischen Fakultäten, Predigerseminare usw. Der Herausgeber gehört der konservativen Richtung an; er hebt mit Recht hervor, daß die Kirche und die Theologie auf der Wahrheit ruhen müsse: „All Sünd' hast du getragen“ und daß alle theologische Arbeit in der Gegenwart an die Bekenntnisse des sechzehnten Jahrhundertts anknüpfen müsse, „weil die Kirche, die sie geschaffen hat, mehr vom Evangelium verstanden hat als die Theologen des neunzehnten Jahrhundertts“ (S. VII). Sonst ist freilich der Standpunkt des Werkes ganz und gar der Standpunkt der deutsch-ländischen Landeskirchen. Wir kennen kein Werk, das einen solchen Einblick gibt in die kirchliche Lage, und wenn man dazu den ebenfalls von uns wiederholt angezeigten amerikanischen *Lutheran World Almanac* hat, so hat man die besten Handbücher zum Nachschlagen über alle kirchlichen Zustände und Verhältnisse der Gegenwart.

A. Fürbringer.

Pastoral Theology. A Handbook of Scriptural Principles. Written especially for pastors of the Lutheran Church. By *John H. C. Fritz, D. D.*, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1932. IX and 343 pages, 6×9. Price, \$3.25.

It is not too much to say that the appearance of this book is hailed with joy throughout the ranks of the clergy of the Missouri Synod, and we hope this will be the case also in many places beyond the confines of our own church-body. It was known for some time that Dr. Fritz was engaged in the writing of this book, and repeatedly inquiries came as to the progress that was being made on it, which showed the great interest with which its publication was awaited. Evidently the book was needed. The esteemed author says in the preface: "This book has been written by request. Two reasons prompted its publication: first, the need in our circles of such a book in the English language; secondly, the desirability of having a book on pastoral theology that gives due consideration to conditions as we must face them at the present time." No one who is acquainted with the situation in which our Church finds itself can dispute the correctness of this statement. It will be well if we point here to the relation between this new book and Walther's classic work on pastoral theology, which during the last half century has served as text-book in our theological seminaries. Dr. Fritz acknowledges that his book is based on that of Walther. For one thing, the underlying principles in Walther's book could not be changed because they represent the teachings of Holy Scripture; for another thing, Walther, being not only a great scholar, but a man of marvelous practical ability and insight, succeeded in casting his discussions into a mold which it is rather difficult to improve upon. But while following Walther, our author never permits himself to be shackled to such an extent that his work resulted merely in a translation. When paragraphs are taken over from Walther's book, usually a number of new thoughts are added. But especially must it be borne in mind that a considerable number of chapters in this book are entirely original. We shall mention merely those that treat such important subjects as the spiritual care of young people and stewardship, including church finances. From this it is evident that the work before us cannot simply be called a reproduction of Walther's *Pastoraltheologie*. It is not designed to displace the latter work. The many quotations in Walther's book, most of which are here omitted, will always retain their value, and we sincerely hope that our ministers will continue to study Walther's fundamental work. But owing to the great amount of new material which Dr. Fritz's book offers and owing to its English dress we hope that every pastor of our church-body and many others will feel that they cannot afford to be without this splendid production.

The book has many excellent features. It is written in a simple, direct, straightforward style, which is admirably adapted for discussing the subjects which constitute that branch of theological study and work which we call pastoral theology. Again, the book is comprehensive. The author has endeavored to treat all the subjects and problems which a pastor would like to see touched on when he approaches a work of this nature. While the discussion is full, we, in browsing in the book, never felt that

the presentation is on the verge of becoming diffuse. Among the special sections which are inserted because the times call for special remarks on the respective subject, we should like to draw attention to the paragraphs on unionism (pp. 218 ff.) and to those on the lodge (pp. 223 ff.). Every reader will agree that these special discussions greatly enhance the value of the book. Finally, although the author always proceeds on the basis of doctrine, linking his remarks to Scripture-passages and enunciating on their basis the great principles that have to be upheld, the work is intensely practical, viewing the minister in his various activities and showing him which course to take as one problem after the other arises before him. It is well known that Dean Fritz has a genius for practical church-work, and we see him here at his best. The publication before us is one of the most important books issued by Concordia Publishing House in recent years. It will be a big factor in fashioning the work of our clergy. We are gratified to see that the book to which such an influential mission has been entrusted is not only Scriptural and conservative in its theology, but in every way a noble production. The exterior of the book, the binding being durable blue buckram, is in keeping with the fine contents. The work goes out with our prayer that God will richly bless it for accomplishing the purposes for which it was written.

W. ARNDT.

Religious Education in the Rural Church. By *Henry W. McLaughlin*. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y. 220 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.50.

This is the type of book that tempts the reviewer to offer a great many quotations. The author is Director of Country Church Work in the Presbyterian Church, U. S., and the entire book breathes his interest in the work in which he is engaged and the purpose of his calling. It is true that the book is written from the standpoint of the author's denomination, that the objectives of religious education as given on p. 99 f. are inadequate, and that individual chapters, like chapter VIII, "The Rural Church and Public Education," could hardly receive our approval because there is too much commingling of Church and State presented in this discussion. But if one keeps these points in mind and uses discrimination, one may profit immensely from the excellent suggestions with which the book abounds. This is particularly true of the paragraphs which set forth the opportunities and the possibilities of work in the rural districts, especially in certain parts of our country, which the author calls "fallow fields." He offers figures to show that many country parishes with able pastors have had a far greater growth than city congregations, and he makes a very convincing plea for more attention to be shown to the rural districts of our country. Among the fine sentences, some of which are truly epigrammatic in form, we quote the following: "Religious education properly executed will do more to cure lawlessness than legal processes" (p. 21). "I fear our seminaries are partly to blame for the city-mindedness of our preachers" (p. 28). "Education divorced from religion has proved to be a national menace" (p. 32). "Outside of the cities of 25,000 or more population 47 adults out of every hundred are not members of any church — Jewish, Mormon, Christian Science, Roman Catholic, or

Protestant" (p. 33 f.). "The family that gathers around the open fire, that uses the same light, and daily has fellowship at the meals can more easily maintain the family altar than the one in the city which is scattered by the multiplicity and complexity of conditions in our modern urban civilization" (p. 56). "The easiest place for the Church to operate is in the country community, where the families dwell on their own farms and do their own work or trade work with their neighbors. In such a community there are no sharply drawn social distinctions; no family is over-rich, and none is exceedingly poor" (p. 65). One is inclined to quote more, especially from the section on the training of rural church-workers and on vacation church-schools, but lack of space forbids. The money invested in this book will bring good returns.

P. E. KREZTMANN.

Christentum und Goethe. Von M. Willkomm. Schriftenverein, Zwidau, Sachsen. 16 Seiten. Preis: 50 Pf.

Eine lichtvolle Behandlung des im Titel angemeldeten Themas. Rektor Willkomm schreibt sine ira et studio, weist aber durch Belege aus der Goetheschen Dichtung und Prosa, besonders auch aus dem „Faust“, nach, daß der große Dichter dem Christentum gegenüber zeitlebens eine ablehnende, durch seinen dem Egoismus und dem Lebens- und Naturgenuß ergebenden Sinn motivierte Stellung eingenommen hat.

L. H. Gräbner.

RECEIVED.

Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift. Herausgegeben von J. Bergdolt, L. J. H. Melz, L. H. Jahn und andern. Deichert, Leipzig. 43. Jahrgang, 7. Heft: R. Frör, „Die Wesensbestimmung des Katholizismus unter der Einwirkung des Hegelschen Idealismus“ (Schluß); Fr. Wiegand, „Die Bedeutung Alberts des Großen für seine Zeit“; B. Moser, „Aus der Geschichte der Lutherbibel des 17. Jahrhunderts“; E. Spranger, „Aus dem Leben eines fränkischen Landpfarrers“, I. Teil (Autobiographie); Dr. Wotfchke, „Das pietistische Halle und die Auslandsdeutschen“, I. Teil; J. Bergdolt, „Zeitschriften-Rundschau“. — 8. Heft: H. Steinlein, „Phantasien von Frau Dr. Rudendorff über Luther und die Reformation“; Dr. Wotfchke, „Das pietistische Halle und die Auslandsdeutschen“ (Schluß); E. Spranger, „Aus dem Leben eines fränkischen Landpfarrers“ (Fortsetzung); J. Bergdolt, „Zeitschriften-Rundschau“.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Feb 33" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.